

CONDITIONAL DILATION ON Γ_n

AVIJIT PAL

ABSTRACT. We study several properties of the closed symmetrized polydisc Γ_n and its distinguished boundary $b\Gamma_n$. We construct the conditional dilation of various classes of Γ_n contractions. Various properties of Γ_n contractions and its explicit dilations allow us to construct a concrete functional model for Γ_n contraction. We also discuss the various characterization for Γ_n unitaries and Γ_n isometries.

1. INTRODUCTION

For $n \geq 2$, let $s : \mathbb{C}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$ be the symmetrization map in n -complex variables $z = (z_1, \dots, z_n)$ given by the formula

$$s(z) = (s_1(z), \dots, s_{n-1}(z), p(z)),$$

where $s_i = \sum_{1 \leq k_1 < \dots < k_i \leq n-1} z_{k_1} \dots z_{k_i}$ and $p = \prod_{i=1}^n z_i$. The image $\Gamma_n := s(\bar{\mathbb{D}}^n)$ under the map s of the unit n -polydisc is known as the closed symmetrized n -disk or simply closed symmetrized polydisc. The map s is also a proper holomorphic map, [63]. The set Γ_n is polynomially convex but not convex, [70]. The open symmetrized polydisc is defined to be the set $\mathbb{G}_n := s(\mathbb{D}^n)$. Also, the image $b\Gamma_n := s(\mathbb{T}^n)$ under the map s of the n torus $\mathbb{T}^n$ is known as the distinguished boundary of symmetrized polydisc.

The key idea behind a dilation is to realize an operator or a mapping into a space of operators as part of something simpler on a larger space. Let Ω be a domain in $\mathbb{C}^n$ and $\mathbf{T} = (T_1, \dots, T_n)$ be a commuting n -tuples of bounded operators defined on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ whose joint spectrum lies in $\bar{\Omega}$. The purpose of the dilation is to find out a commuting n -tuples of normal operator $\mathbf{N} = (N_1, \dots, N_n)$ defined on a bigger Hilbert space $\mathcal{K}$ containing $\mathcal{H}$ as a subspace whose joint spectrum also lies in $\bar{\Omega}$ such that $T_i = P_{\mathcal{H}} N_i|_{\mathcal{H}}$, where $P_{\mathcal{H}}$ is the orthogonal projection of $\mathcal{K}$ onto $\mathcal{H}$. In 1951, von Neumann proved the surprising result that, for any contraction, closed unit disc is a spectral set.

Theorem 1.1. (see [58, Chapter 1, Corollary 1.2]) *Suppose T is a bounded linear operator on a separable complex Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$. Then*

$$\|p(T)\| \leq \|p\|_{\infty, \mathbb{D}} := \sup\{|p(z)| : |z| < 1\}$$

if and only if $\|T\| \leq 1$.

The original proof of this inequality is intricate. A couple of decades later, the foundation of model theory was the discovery by B. Sz.-Nagy that every contractions has an extension that is co-isometry, and a dilation that is unitary.

Theorem 1.2. (see [58, Chapter 4, Theorem 4.3]) *A bounded linear operator T admits a unitary (power) dilation if and only there exists a unitary operator U on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{K} \supseteq \mathcal{H}$ such that*

$$P_{\mathcal{H}} p(U)|_{\mathcal{H}} = p(T),$$

for all polynomials p .

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 32A60, 32C15, 47A13, 47A15, 47A20, 47A25, 47A45.

Key words and phrases. Symmetrized polydisc, Spectral set, Complete spectral set, Wold decomposition, Pure-isometry, Rational dilation, Operator model.

The work of A. Pal was supported through the NBHM Post-doctoral Fellowship.

This construction is due to Schaffer [69]. Clearly, the von Neumann inequality follows from the existence of a power dilation via the spectral theorem for unitary operators. Many questions related to the von Neumann inequality have been studied. Typically, these questions involve replacing, the polynomial ring $(P[z], \|\cdot\|_{\infty, \mathbb{D}})$ with some other ring of functions, the rings of rational functions $\text{Rat}(\Omega)$ with poles off $\bar{\Omega}$ on some open, bounded, connected subset of $\mathbb{C}$, equipped with the supremum norm on Ω . Sz-Nagy proved that the dilation theorem even holds for all rational functions with poles off $\bar{\mathbb{D}}$.

A homomorphism $\rho_T : \text{Rat}(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ admits a normal dilation if there exists a normal operator $N : \mathcal{K} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}$, $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{K}$ and $\sigma(N) \subseteq \partial\Omega$ such that

$$P_{\mathcal{H}} r(N)|_{\mathcal{H}} = r(T).$$

The homomorphism $r \mapsto r(N)$ is contractive, follows from the existence of a normal dilation. Let $R = ((r_{ij}))$, $r_{ij} \in \text{Rat}(\Omega)$ be a matrix valued rational function. Let

$$\|R\| = \sup\{\|((r_{ij}(z)))\|_{\text{op}} : z \in \Omega\}.$$

Define $R(T)$ naturally to be the operator $((r_{ij}(T)))$. The homomorphism ρ_T is said to be completely contractive if $\|R(T)\| \leq \|R\|_{\infty, \Omega}$ for all $R \in \text{Rat}(\Omega) \otimes \mathcal{M}_k(\mathbb{C})$, $k = 1, 2, \dots, n, \dots$. In the very fundamental work of Arveson [1, 15], he studied the normal dilation in detail and showed that the existence of a normal dilation is equivalent to complete contractivity of the homomorphism ρ_T . In 1984, J. Agler (see [3]) proved that if Ω is the annulus $\mathbb{A}$, then every contractive homomorphisms of the ring $\text{Rat}(\mathbb{A})$ are completely contractive. Recently, M. Dristchell and S. McCullough [31] have shown that for a domain Ω of connectivity ≥ 2 , one can construct a contractive homomorphism of $\text{Rat}(\Omega)$ which is not completely contractive.

Most of these notions apply to the rings of polynomials in more than one variable, or even to the ring of holomorphic functions, in a neighborhood of $\bar{\Omega}$, where Ω is some open bounded connected subset of $\mathbb{C}^m$. Indeed, the theorem of Arveson remains valid in this more general setting. The first dilation theorem for a commuting pair of contractions was proved by Ando.

Theorem 1.3. (see [58, Chapter 5, Theorem 5.5]) *Let T_1, T_2 be a pair of commuting contractions. Then there exists a pair of commuting unitaries, which dilate T_1, T_2 simultaneously, that is,*

$$P_{\mathcal{H}}(p(U_1, U_2))|_{\mathcal{H}} = p(T_1, T_2)$$

.

An example of considerable importance to the theory of dilations of contractions was given by Parrott. He showed that there are three commuting contractions for which it is impossible to find commuting unitaries dilating them. G. Misra in the papers [45], [46] and [47] began the study of Parrott like examples, comparing the norm and the cb-norm, on domains $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}^m$ other than the tri-disc. Vern Paulsen and E. Ricard proved that if $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{C}^n$, $n \geq 3$ is the open unit ball of a norm on $\mathbb{C}^n$, then there is a unital contractive homomorphism of $\text{Rat}(\Omega)$ which is not completely contractive. The failure of rational dilation on the tetrablock was also shown by S. Pal [52]. Let $\Omega_{\mathbf{A}} = \{(z_1, z_2) : \|z_1 A_1 + z_2 A_2\| \leq 1\}$, where A_1, A_2 are 2×2 linearly independent matrices. The author and his collaborators proved that if A_1, A_2 are not simultaneously diagonalizable via unitary, then one can construct a contractive homomorphism of $\Omega_{\mathbf{A}}$, which is not completely contractive, [43].

Now we recall the definition of Γ_n contraction and complete Γ_n contraction.

Definition 1.4. A commuting n -tuples of operators $(S_1, \dots, S_{n-1}, P)$ on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ for which Γ_n is a spectral set (complete spectral set) is called Γ_n contraction (complete Γ_n contraction).

We also recall the Γ_n unitaries, Γ_n isometries and pure Γ_n isometry from the paper of S. Biswas and S. Shyam Roy, [21].

Definition 1.5. Let $S_1, \dots, S_{n-1}, P$ be commuting n -tuples of operators on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$. We say that $(S_1, \dots, S_{n-1}, P)$ is

- (1) a Γ_n unitary if $S_1, \dots, S_{n-1}, P$ are normal operators and the joint spectrum $\sigma(S_1, \dots, S_{n-1}, P)$ of $(S_1, \dots, S_{n-1}, P)$ is contained in the distinguish boundary of Γ_n .

- (2) a Γ_n isometry if there exists a Hilbert space $\mathcal{K}$ containing $\mathcal{H}$ and a Γ_n unitary $(\tilde{S}_1, \dots, \tilde{S}_{n-1}, \tilde{P})$ on $\mathcal{K}$ such that $\mathcal{H}$ is a common invariant subspace for $\tilde{S}_1, \dots, \tilde{S}_{n-1}, \tilde{P}$ and that $S_i = \tilde{S}_i|_{\mathcal{H}}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$ and $P = \tilde{P}|_{\mathcal{H}}$.
- (3) a Γ_n -co-isometry if $(S_1^*, \dots, S_{n-1}^*, P^*)$ is a Γ_n isometry.
- (4) a pure Γ_n isometry if $(S_1, \dots, S_{n-1}, P)$ is a Γ_n isometry and P is a pure isometry.

For commuting n -tuples of operators $(S_1, \dots, S_{n-1}, P)$ with $\|P\| \leq 1$, we consider the following operator equations

$$S_i - S_{n-i}^* P = D_P E_i D_P, S_{n-i} - S_i^* P = \overline{D_P E_{n-i} D_P} \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, n-1,$$

where $D_P = (I - P^* P)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ and $\mathcal{D}_P = \overline{\text{Ran } D_P}$. These equations are called the fundamental equations for $(S_1, \dots, S_{n-1}, P)$. The $n-1$ -tuples of operators E_i for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$ are called the fundamental operators. The $n-1$ -tuples of fundamental operators E_i for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$ play an important role in detecting the failure of rational dilation on Γ_n and determining a class of Γ_n contractions which dilate to Γ_n -unitaries.

The only other dilation theorem, in the multi-variable context is due to Agler and Young which is for the Symmetrized bi-disc [8, 13]. In [53], S. Pal showed by a counter example that it fails in dimension three, that is, on closed symmetrized tri-disc Γ_3 . In [53], he also found various occasions for which a Γ_3 contraction can have a $b\Gamma_3$ -normal dilation and constructed their explicit dilation. In [53], various characterizations for Γ_n unitaries and Γ_n isometries have been also described. Being motivated by this work of S. Pal [53], we want to generalize this notion for the case of arbitrary n , that is, for closed symmetrized poly-disc Γ_n .

Our main results are as follows. In section-2, we prove several elementary estimates and provide a set of characterizations for the points of the closed symmetrized polydisc and distinguish boundary of Γ_n . In Theorem 2.3, we prove that the positivity of $\Phi_{1k(i)}^{(i)}$ and $\Phi_{2k(i)}^{(i)}$ with $k(i) \geq \binom{n-1}{i} + \binom{n-1}{n-i}$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$ is equivalent to the condition for a point $(s_1, \dots, s_{n-1}, p) \in \Gamma_n$. In other words, the success of rational dilation for the case of scalar follows from the positivity of $\Phi_{1k(i)}^{(i)}$ and $\Phi_{2k(i)}^{(i)}$ with $k(i) \geq \binom{n-1}{i} + \binom{n-1}{n-i}$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$. A point $(s_1, \dots, s_{n-1}, p) \in \mathbb{G}_n$ is equivalent to the polynomial $P(z) = z^n - s_1 z^{n-1} + \dots + (-1)^n p$ has all roots inside $\mathbb{D}$. To verify whether all the roots of a polynomial are inside $\mathbb{D}$, the well known Schur theorem [61, 67] is a standard tool. In Theorem 2.3, we also prove that a point $(s_1, \dots, s_{n-1}, p) \in \mathbb{G}_n$ is equivalent to Schur theorem. We believe that this result may also be important for studying Γ_n contraction for $(S_1, \dots, S_{n-1}, P)$.

Section 3 is devoted to Γ_n contraction and their fundamental operators. It is easy to see that if $(S_1, \dots, S_{n-1}, P)$ is a Γ_n contraction then so are $(S_{n-1}, S_{n-2}, \dots, S_2, S_1, P)$ and $(S_1^*, \dots, S_{n-1}^*, P^*)$. Also one can easily verify that if $(S_1, \dots, S_{n-1}, P)$ is a Γ_n contraction then $\|S_i\| \leq \binom{n-1}{i} + \binom{n-1}{n-i}$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$ and $\|P\| \leq 1$. In Proposition 3.8, we prove that the positivity of $\Phi_{1k(i)}^{(i)}$ and $\Phi_{2k(i)}^{(i)}$ with $k(i) \geq \binom{n-1}{i} + \binom{n-1}{n-i}$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$ is necessary but not sufficient for the case of operator, that is, if $(S_1, \dots, S_{n-1}, P)$ is a Γ_n contraction then

$$\Phi_{1k(i)}^{(i)}(\alpha^i S_i, \alpha^{n-i} S_{n-i}, \alpha^n P) \geq 0$$

and

$$\Phi_{2k(i)}^{(i)}(\alpha^i S_i, \alpha^{n-i} S_{n-i}, \alpha^n p) \geq 0$$

for all $\alpha \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}$ with $k(i) \geq \binom{n-1}{i} + \binom{n-1}{n-i}$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$. Using this result, we show the existence and uniqueness theorem for $n-1$ tuples of fundamental operators E_i for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$.

In section 4, we prove the various properties of Γ_n unitary and Γ_n isometry. Theorem 4.1 states that a Γ_n unitary is equivalent to the symmetrization of n commuting unitaries. But this is no longer true for the case of Γ_n contraction. S. Biswas and S. Sham Roy [21] showed by an example that the symmetrization of three contractions may not be a Γ_3 contraction. Theorem 4.3 says that every Γ_n isometry admit Wold decomposition, that is, a Γ_n isometry decomposes into two parts: one is a Γ_n unitary and other is a pure Γ_n isometry.

In section 5 we will find out the necessary conditions for the existence of rational dilation. First, we will define Γ_n isometric dilation of Γ_n -contraction. In Proposition 5.4, we prove that if $(S_1, \dots, S_{n-1}, P)$ be a Γ_n -contraction on $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_1 \oplus \mathcal{H}_2$ with $n-1$ tuples of fundamental operators $(E_1, \dots, E_{n-1})$ and P is such that

- (1) $\ker(D_P) = \mathcal{H}_1 \oplus \{0\}$ and $\mathcal{D}_P = \{0\} \oplus \mathcal{H}_1$;
- (2) $P(\mathcal{D}_P) = \{0\}$ and $P \ker(D_P) \subseteq \mathcal{D}_P$.

and $(S_1^*, \dots, S_{n-1}^*, P^*)$ has Γ_n -isometric dilation, then it is necessary that the $n-1$ tuples of fundamental operators $(E_1, \dots, E_{n-1})$ satisfies the following conditions:

- (1) $[E_i, E_j] = 0$, where $[P, Q] = PQ - QP$;
- (2) $[E_i, E_{n-j}^*] = [E_j, E_{n-i}^*]$ for $1 \leq i, j \leq n-1$.

In section 6, we describe certain conditions for which a Γ_n contraction can have a $b\Gamma_n$ -normal dilation. The failure of rational dilation have been described in [53]. We are able to show that if the commuting $(n-1)$ -tuple of Fundamental Operators $E_1, \dots, E_{n-1}$ and $F_1, \dots, F_{n-1}$ of a Γ_n -contractions of $(S_1, \dots, S_{n-1}, P)$ and its adjoint $(S_1^*, \dots, S_{n-1}^*, P^*)$ respectively, satisfy the conditions $E_l E_{n-k}^* - E_k E_{n-l}^* = E_{n-k}^* E_l - E_{n-l}^* E_k$ and $F_l^* F_{n-k} - F_k^* F_{n-l} = F_{n-k} F_l^* - F_{n-l} F_k^*$, then $(S_1, \dots, S_{n-1}, P)$ posses a Γ_n -unitary dilation. In Theorem 6.3, we construct explicit Γ_n unitary dilation. As a corollary of the Theorem 6.3, we obtain Γ_n isometric of $(S_1, \dots, S_{n-1}, P)$.

In section 7, we construct a concrete and explicit functional model for a class of Γ_n -contractions of $(S_1, \dots, S_{n-1}, P)$ for which the adjoint $(S_1^*, \dots, S_{n-1}^*, P^*)$ has $n-1$ tuples of fundamental operators $(F_1, \dots, F_{n-1})$ satisfying the following conditions:

- (1) $[F_{n-i}, F_{n-j}] = 0$ for $i, j = 1, \dots, n-1$;
- (2) $[F_i, F_{n-j}^*] = [F_j, F_{n-i}^*]$ for $i, j = 1, \dots, n-1$.

2. SCHUR'S CRITERION AND SOME PROPERTIES OF SYMMETRIZED POLY-DISC

We recall the definition of symmetric map $s : \mathbb{C}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$ in n -complex variables $z = (z_1, \dots, z_n)$ which is given by the formula

$$s(z) = (s_1(z), \dots, s_{n-1}(z), p(z)),$$

where $s_i = \sum_{1 \leq k_1 < \dots < k_i \leq n-1} z_{k_1} \dots z_{k_i}$ and $p = \prod_{i=1}^n z_i$. Also, a point $(s_1, \dots, s_{n-1}, p) \in \mathbb{G}_n$ is equivalent to the polynomial $P(z) = z^n - s_1 z^{n-1} + \dots + (-1)^n p$ has all roots inside $\mathbb{D}$. Schur theorem [61, 67] is a standard tool for deceeding whether the zeros of the polynomial lie in $\mathbb{D}$. In Theorem 2.3 and 2.1, we will see that a point $(s_1, \dots, s_{n-1}, p) \in \mathbb{G}_n$ is equivalent to Schur theorem.

For $k(i) \geq \binom{n-1}{i} + \binom{n-1}{n-i}$ and $i = 1, \dots, n-1$, we define operators $\Phi_{1k(i)}^{(i)}$ and $\Phi_{2k(i)}^{(i)}$ for commuting n tuples of bounded operators $(S_1, \dots, S_{n-1}, P)$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_{1k(i)}^{(i)}(\alpha^i S_i, \alpha^{n-i} S_{n-i}, \alpha^n P) &= k(i)^2(1 - |\alpha^n P|^2) + (|\alpha^i S_i|^2 - |\alpha^{n-i} S_{n-i}|^2) \\ &\quad - k(i)\alpha^i(S_i - |\alpha|^{2n-2i} S_{n-i}^* P) - k(i)\bar{\alpha}^i(S_i^* - |\alpha|^{2n-2i} S_{n-i} P^*) \end{aligned} \quad (2.1)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_{2k(i)}^{(i)}(\alpha^i S_i, \alpha^{n-i} S_{n-i}, \alpha^n P) &= k(i)^2(1 - |\alpha^n P|^2) + (|\alpha^{n-i} S_{n-i}|^2 - |\alpha^i S_i|^2) \\ &\quad - k(i)\alpha^{n-i}(S_{n-i} - |\alpha|^{2i} S_i^* P) - k(i)\bar{\alpha}^{n-i}(S_{n-i}^* - |\alpha|^{2i} S_i P^*). \end{aligned} \quad (2.2)$$

In particular, if $S_1, \dots, S_{n-1}, P$ are scalar, then $\Phi_{1k(i)}^{(i)}$ and $\Phi_{2k(i)}^{(i)}$ are of the following form

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_{1k(i)}^{(i)}(\alpha^i s_i, \alpha^{n-i} s_{n-i}, \alpha^n p) &= k(i)^2(1 - |\alpha^n p|^2) + (|\alpha^i s_i|^2 - |\alpha^{n-i} s_{n-i}|^2) \\ &\quad - k(i)\alpha^i(s_i - |\alpha|^{2n-2i} \bar{s}_{n-i} p) - k(i)\bar{\alpha}^i(\bar{s}_i - |\alpha|^{2n-2i} s_{n-i} \bar{p}) \end{aligned} \quad (2.3)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_{2k(i)}^{(i)}(\alpha^i s_i, \alpha^{n-i} s_{n-i}, \alpha^n p) &= k(i)^2(1 - |\alpha^n p|^2) + (|\alpha^{n-i} s_{n-i}|^2 - |\alpha^i s_i|^2) \\ &\quad - k(i)\alpha^{n-i}(s_{n-i} - |\alpha|^{2i} \bar{s}_i p) - k(i)\bar{\alpha}^{n-i}(\bar{s}_{n-i} - |\alpha|^{2i} s_i \bar{p}). \end{aligned} \quad (2.4)$$

Theorem 2.1. *For $(s_1, s_2, \dots, s_{n-1}, p) \in \mathbb{C}^n$, $n \geq 3$ the following properties are equivalent:*

- (1) $(s_1, s_2, \dots, s_{n-1}, p) \in b\Gamma_n$
- (2) $(s_1, s_2, \dots, s_{n-1}, p) \in \Gamma_n$ and $|p| = 1$
- (3) $|p| = 1$, $s_i = \bar{s}_{n-i} p$ and $|s_i| \leq \binom{n-1}{i} + \binom{n-1}{n-i}$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$. In particular, if $n = 2m+1$ then $|s_1| = |s_{2m}|, \dots, |s_m| = |s_{m+1}|$ and if $n = 2m$ then $|s_1| = |s_{2m-1}|, \dots, |s_{m-1}| = |s_{m+1}|$

(4) $|p| = 1$ and there exist $c_1, \dots, c_{n-1}$ with the condition $|c_i| + |c_{n-i}| \leq \binom{n-1}{i} + \binom{n-1}{n-i}$ such that $s_i = c_i + \bar{c}_{n-i}p$, $s_{n-i} = c_{n-i} + \bar{c}_i p$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$.

Proof. We shall show that $(1) \Rightarrow (2) \Rightarrow (4) \Rightarrow (3) \Rightarrow (1)$. The implication of $(1) \Rightarrow (2)$ is obvious.

Suppose (2) holds. Since $(s_1, s_2, \dots, s_{n-1}, p) \in b\Gamma_n$, there exist $z_1, \dots, z_n \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}$ such that for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$, $s_i = \sum_{1 \leq k_1 < \dots < k_i \leq n-1} z_{k_1} \dots z_{k_i}$ and $p = \prod_{i=1}^n z_i$. Again the condition $|p| = 1$, implies that $|z_1| = \dots = |z_n| = 1$. Now,

$$\begin{aligned} s_i &= \sum_{1 \leq k_1 < \dots < k_i \leq n} z_{k_1} \dots z_{k_i} \\ &= c_i + \bar{c}_{n-i}p, \end{aligned}$$

where $c_i = \sum_{1 \leq l_1 < \dots < l_i \leq n-1} z_{l_1} \dots z_{l_i}$ and $c_{n-i} = \sum_{1 \leq r_1 < \dots < r_{n-i} \leq n-1} z_{r_1} \dots z_{r_{n-i}}$.

Similarly, we can show that $s_{n-i} = c_{n-i} + \bar{c}_i p$. As $|z_1| = \dots = |z_n| = 1$, we have $|c_i| + |c_{n-i}| \leq \binom{n-1}{i} + \binom{n-1}{n-i}$.

(4) $\Rightarrow$ (3) is also obvious.

Now we shall show that (3) $\Rightarrow$ (1). Suppose (3) holds. Consider the polynomial

$$P(z) = z^n - s_1 z^{n-1} + \dots + (-1)^n p.$$

Suppose $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n$ are the roots of the polynomial $P(z) = 0$. It requires to show that $|\beta_1| = \dots = |\beta_n| = 1$.

Let S be the $n \times n$ "Shift matrix" which is of the form $S = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 1 \end{pmatrix}$. If P is as above, then $P(S) = \begin{pmatrix} (-1)^n p & (-1)^{n-1} s_{n-1} & \dots & s_2 & -s_1 \\ 0 & (-1)^n p & \dots & -s_3 & s_2 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & (-1)^n p \end{pmatrix}$. On performing a similar calculation for the polynomial Q given by $Q(z) = z^n \overline{P(\frac{1}{z})}$, we have $Q(S) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 - \bar{s}_1 & \dots & (-1)^{n-2} \bar{s}_{n-2} & (-1)^{n-1} \bar{s}_{n-1} \\ 0 & 1 & \dots & (-1)^{n-3} \bar{s}_{n-3} & (-1)^{n-2} \bar{s}_{n-2} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$.

Let $L = Q(S)^* Q(S) - P(S)^* P(S)$. Then

$$L = \begin{pmatrix} 1 - |p|^2 & -(\bar{s}_1 - s_{n-1} \bar{p}) & (\bar{s}_2 - s_{n-2} \bar{p}) & \dots & (-1)^{n-1} (\bar{s}_{n-1} - s_1 \bar{p}) \\ -(s_1 - \bar{s}_{n-1} p) & (1 - |p|^2) + (|s_1|^2 - |s_{n-1}|^2) - (\bar{s}_1 - s_{n-1} \bar{p})(s_1 - \bar{s}_{n-1} p) & (\bar{s}_{n-1} s_{n-2} - \bar{s}_2 s_1) & \dots & (-1)^{n-2} (\bar{s}_{n-2} - s_2 \bar{p}) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ (-1)^{n-1} (s_{n-1} - \bar{s}_1 p) & (-1)^{n-2} (s_{n-2} - \bar{s}_2 p) & (-1)^{n-3} (s_{n-3} - \bar{s}_3 p) & \dots & 1 - |p|^2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Since $|p| = 1$, $s_i = \bar{s}_{n-i} p$, we have $\bar{s}_i = s_{n-i} \bar{p}$. Therefore, $L = 0$. Since $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n$ are the roots of the polynomial $P(z) = 0$, we have

$$P(z) = (z - \beta_1) \dots (z - \beta_n) \text{ and } Q(z) = (1 - \bar{\beta}_1 z) \dots (1 - \bar{\beta}_n z).$$

Let $A_i = S - \beta_i I$ and $B_i = I - \bar{\beta}_i S$, for $i = 1, \dots, n$. Then it is easy to show that $P(S) = A_1 \dots A_n$ and $Q(S) = B_1 \dots B_n$. Also, it can be easily verified that for $i = 1, \dots, n$, each A_i commutes with each B_i and

$$A_i^* A_i - B_i^* B_i = (1 - |\beta_i|^2)(I - S^* S),$$

where $(I - S^* S)$ is a projection of rank one and we denote it by $\tilde{P}$. Thus the matrix L can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} L &= Q(S)^* Q(S) - P(S)^* P(S) \\ &= B_n^* \dots B_1^* B_1 \dots B_n - A_n^* \dots A_1^* A_1 \dots A_n \\ &= (B_n^* \dots B_2^* B_1^* B_1 B_2 \dots B_n - B_n^* \dots B_2^* A_1^* A_1 B_2 \dots B_n) + (B_n^* \dots B_3^* A_1^* B_2^* B_2 A_1 B_3 \dots B_n \\ &\quad - B_n^* \dots B_3^* A_1^* A_2^* A_2 A_1 B_3 \dots B_n) + \dots \\ &\quad + (A_{n-1}^* \dots A_2^* A_1^* B_n^* B_n A_1 A_2 \dots A_{n-1} - A_{n-1}^* \dots A_2^* A_1^* A_n^* A_n A_1 A_2 \dots A_{n-1}) \\ &= B_n^* \dots B_2^* (B_1^* B_1 - A_1^* A_1) B_2 \dots B_n + B_n^* \dots B_3^* A_1^* (B_2^* B_2 - A_2^* A_2) A_1 B_3 \dots B_n + \dots \\ &\quad + A_{n-1}^* \dots A_2^* A_1^* (B_n^* B_n - A_n^* A_n) A_1 A_2 \dots A_{n-1} \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - |\beta_i|^2) V_i^* V_i, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$V_1 = \tilde{P}B_2 \dots B_n, V_2 = \tilde{P}A_1B_3 \dots B_n, V_3 = \tilde{P}A_1A_2B_4 \dots B_n, \dots, V_n = \tilde{P}A_1A_2 \dots A_{n-1}.$$

Thus, the condition $L = 0$, implies that

$$(1 - |\beta_i|^2)V_i^*V_i = 0, \text{ for all } i.$$

Also, it can be easily verified that $V_i \neq 0$ for all i . Two conditions $p = \beta_1 \dots \beta_n$ and $|p| = 1$, together imply that none of the β_i 's is zero. Thus, we have $1 - |\beta_i|^2 = 0$ for all i . This completes the proof. $\square$

Lemma 2.2. *Let $(s_1, s_2, \dots, s_{n-1}, p)$ be an arbitrary point in Γ_n and $(c_1, \dots, c_{n-1})$ be also an arbitrary point in Γ_{n-1} with $\alpha^i s_i = c_i + \bar{c}_{n-i}(\alpha^n p)$, $\alpha^{n-i} s_{n-i} = c_{n-i} + \bar{c}_i(\alpha^n p)$ for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$ and for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{D}$. Then*

$$|c_i|^2 - |c_{n-i}|^2 \leq \left(\binom{n-1}{i} + \binom{n-1}{n-i} \right) \left(\binom{n-1}{i} - \binom{n-1}{n-i} \right) \text{ if } n > 2i.$$

Proof. Set $P_i^n = \sum_{1 \leq k_1 < \dots < k_i \leq n} z_{k_1} \dots z_{k_i}$ and $\bar{P}_i^n = \sum_{1 \leq k_1 < \dots < k_i \leq n} \bar{z}_{k_1} \dots \bar{z}_{k_i}$. We will prove it by induction on $n-1$. If $(s_1, s_2, p) \in \Gamma_3$ and $(c_1, c_2) \in \Gamma_2$, then we have $\alpha^i s_i = c_i + \bar{c}_{n-i}(\alpha^3 p)$ for $i = 1, 2$ and for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{D}$. Now,

$$\begin{aligned} |c_1|^2 - |c_2|^2 &= |P_1^2|^2 - |P_2^2|^2 \\ &= |z_1 + z_2|^2 - |z_1 z_2|^2 \\ &\leq (|z_1| + |z_2| + |z_1 z_2|)(|z_1| + |z_2| - |z_1 z_2|) \\ &\leq 3(|z_1|(1 - |z_2|) + |z_2|) \\ &= \left(\binom{2}{1} + \binom{2}{2} \right) \left(\binom{2}{1} - \binom{2}{2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, the result is true for $n = 3$. For $i = 3$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |c_1|^2 - |c_3|^2 &= |P_1^3|^2 - |P_3^3|^2 \\ &= |z_1 + z_2 + z_3|^2 - |z_1 z_2 z_3|^2 \\ &\leq (|z_1| + |z_2| + |z_3| + |z_1 z_2 z_3|)(|z_1| + |z_2| + |z_3| - |z_1 z_2 z_3|) \\ &\leq 4(|z_1|(1 - |z_2||z_3|) + |z_2| + |z_3|) \\ &\leq 4(1 - |z_2||z_3| + |z_2| + |z_3|) \\ &\leq \left(\binom{3}{1} + \binom{3}{3} \right) \left(\binom{3}{1} - \binom{3}{3} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, the result is true for $n = 4$. Now we will prove for the case $n = 5$. Similar to the case for $n = 3, 4$, one can easily show that $|c_1|^2 - |c_4|^2 \leq \left(\binom{4}{1} + \binom{4}{4} \right) \left(\binom{4}{1} - \binom{4}{4} \right)$. Now we will show that

$$|c_2|^2 - |c_3|^2 \leq \left(\binom{4}{2} + \binom{4}{3} \right) \left(\binom{4}{2} - \binom{4}{3} \right).$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} |c_2|^2 - |c_3|^2 &= |P_2^3 + z_4 P_1^3|^2 - |P_3^3 + z_4 P_2^3|^2 \\ &= |P_2^3|^2 + |z_4 P_1^3|^2 + 2 \operatorname{Re} \bar{P}_2^3 z_4 P_1^3 - |P_3^3|^2 - |z_4 P_2^3|^2 - 2 \operatorname{Re} \bar{P}_3^3 z_4 P_2^3 \\ &= |z_4|^2 (|P_1^3|^2 - |P_2^3|^2) + |P_2^3|^2 - |P_3^3|^2 + 2 \operatorname{Re} z_4 (\bar{P}_2^3 P_1^3 - \bar{P}_3^3 P_2^3). \end{aligned} \tag{2.5}$$

We will now consider the following cases.

Case-1: $\{ |P_1^3|^2 > |P_2^3|^2, |P_2^3|^2 > |P_3^3|^2, 2 \operatorname{Re} z_4 (\bar{P}_2^3 P_1^3 - \bar{P}_3^3 P_2^3) > 0 \}$:

Since $|P_1^3|^2 > |P_2^3|^2, |P_2^3|^2 > |P_3^3|^2, 2 \operatorname{Re} z_4 (\bar{P}_2^3 P_1^3 - \bar{P}_3^3 P_2^3) > 0$, from Equation 2.5, we have

$$|c_2|^2 - |c_3|^2 \leq (|P_1^3|^2 - |P_3^3|^2) + 2 \operatorname{Re} z_4 (\bar{P}_2^3 P_1^3 - \bar{P}_3^3 P_2^3). \tag{2.6}$$

From Inequality 2.6, it requires to show that the total sum of R.H.S is less than 20. We have already seen that the sum of $|P_1^3|^2 - |P_3^3|^2$ is less than 8. If we can show that the sum of $2 \operatorname{Re} z_4(\bar{P}_2^3 P_1^3 - \bar{P}_3^3 P_2^3)$ is less than $2(\binom{3}{2}\binom{3}{1} - \binom{3}{3}\binom{3}{2})$, then we are done. Now, we get

$$\begin{aligned} 2 \operatorname{Re} z_4(\bar{P}_2^3 P_1^3 - \bar{P}_3^3 P_2^3) &= 2 \operatorname{Re} z_4\{(\bar{P}_2^2 + \bar{z}_3 \bar{P}_1^2)(P_1^2 + z_3) - \bar{z}_3 \bar{P}_2^2(P_2^2 + z_3 P_1^2)\} \\ &= 2 \operatorname{Re} z_4\{\bar{P}_2^2 P_1^2 + \bar{z}_3 |P_1^2|^2 + z_3 \bar{P}_2^2 + |z_3|^2 \bar{P}_1^2 - \bar{z}_3 |P_2^2|^2 - |z_3|^2 \bar{P}_2^2 P_1^2\} \\ &= 2 \operatorname{Re} z_4\{\bar{P}_2^2 P_1^2 + \bar{z}_3(|P_1^2|^2 - |P_2^2|^2) + z_3 \bar{P}_2^2 + |z_3|^2(\bar{P}_1^2 - \bar{P}_2^2 P_1^2)\}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.7)$$

Now we will consider four sub-cases.

Sub-Case-1: $\{|P_1^2|^2 > |P_2^2|^2, 2 \operatorname{Re} z_4(\bar{P}_1^2 - \bar{P}_2^2 P_1^2) > 0\}$:

Since $|P_1^2|^2 > |P_2^2|^2, 2 \operatorname{Re} z_4(\bar{P}_1^2 - \bar{P}_2^2 P_1^2) > 0$, from Equation 2.7, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 2 \operatorname{Re} z_4(\bar{P}_2^3 P_1^3 - \bar{P}_3^3 P_2^3) &\leq 2 \operatorname{Re} z_4\{(|P_1^2|^2 - |P_2^2|^2) + z_3 \bar{P}_2^2 + \bar{P}_1^2\} \\ &\leq 2(\binom{3}{2}\binom{3}{1} - \binom{3}{3}\binom{3}{2}). \end{aligned}$$

Sub-Case-2: $\{|P_1^2|^2 < |P_2^2|^2, 2 \operatorname{Re} z_4(\bar{P}_1^2 - \bar{P}_2^2 P_1^2) > 0\}$:

Since $|P_1^2|^2 < |P_2^2|^2, 2 \operatorname{Re} z_4(\bar{P}_1^2 - \bar{P}_2^2 P_1^2) > 0$, from Equation 2.7, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 2 \operatorname{Re} z_4(\bar{P}_2^3 P_1^3 - \bar{P}_3^3 P_2^3) &\leq 2 \operatorname{Re} z_4\{z_3 \bar{P}_2^2 + \bar{P}_1^2\} \\ &\leq 2(\binom{3}{2}\binom{3}{1} - \binom{3}{3}\binom{3}{2}). \end{aligned}$$

Sub-Case-3: $\{|P_1^2|^2 > |P_2^2|^2, 2 \operatorname{Re} z_4(\bar{P}_1^2 - \bar{P}_2^2 P_1^2) < 0\}$:

Since $|P_1^2|^2 > |P_2^2|^2, 2 \operatorname{Re} z_4(\bar{P}_1^2 - \bar{P}_2^2 P_1^2) < 0$, from Equation 2.7, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 2 \operatorname{Re} z_4(\bar{P}_2^3 P_1^3 - \bar{P}_3^3 P_2^3) &\leq 2 \operatorname{Re} z_4\{\bar{P}_2^2 P_1^2 + (|P_1^2|^2 - |P_2^2|^2) + z_3 \bar{P}_2^2\} \\ &\leq 2(\binom{3}{2}\binom{3}{1} - \binom{3}{3}\binom{3}{2}). \end{aligned}$$

Sub-Case-4: $\{|P_1^2|^2 < |P_2^2|^2, 2 \operatorname{Re} z_4(\bar{P}_1^2 - \bar{P}_2^2 P_1^2) < 0\}$:

Since $|P_1^2|^2 < |P_2^2|^2, 2 \operatorname{Re} z_4(\bar{P}_1^2 - \bar{P}_2^2 P_1^2) < 0$, from Equation 2.7, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 2 \operatorname{Re} z_4(\bar{P}_2^3 P_1^3 - \bar{P}_3^3 P_2^3) &\leq 2 \operatorname{Re} z_4\{\bar{P}_2^2 P_1^2 + z_3 \bar{P}_2^2\} \\ &\leq 2(\binom{3}{2}\binom{3}{1} - \binom{3}{3}\binom{3}{2}). \end{aligned}$$

Combining all sub-cases, we conclude that

$$|c_2|^2 - |c_3|^2 \leq (\binom{4}{2} + \binom{4}{3})(\binom{4}{2} - \binom{4}{3}).$$

Case-2: $\{|P_1^3|^2 > |P_2^3|^2, |P_2^3|^2 > |P_3^3|^2, 2 \operatorname{Re} z_4(\bar{P}_2^3 P_1^3 - \bar{P}_3^3 P_2^3) < 0\}$:

Since $|P_1^3|^2 > |P_2^3|^2, |P_2^3|^2 > |P_3^3|^2, 2 \operatorname{Re} z_4(\bar{P}_2^3 P_1^3 - \bar{P}_3^3 P_2^3) < 0$, from Equation 2.5, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |c_2|^2 - |c_3|^2 &\leq (|P_1^3|^2 - |P_3^3|^2) \\ &\leq (\binom{4}{2} + \binom{4}{3})(\binom{4}{2} - \binom{4}{3}). \end{aligned}$$

Case-3: $\{|P_1^3|^2 > |P_2^3|^2, |P_2^3|^2 < |P_3^3|^2, 2 \operatorname{Re} z_4(\bar{P}_2^3 P_1^3 - \bar{P}_3^3 P_2^3) > 0\}$:

Since $|P_1^3|^2 > |P_2^3|^2, |P_2^3|^2 < |P_3^3|^2, 2 \operatorname{Re} z_4(\bar{P}_2^3 P_1^3 - \bar{P}_3^3 P_2^3) > 0$, from Equation 2.5, we have

$$|c_2|^2 - |c_3|^2 \leq (|P_1^3|^2 - |P_3^3|^2) + 2 \operatorname{Re} z_4(\bar{P}_2^3 P_1^3 - \bar{P}_3^3 P_2^3).$$

Similar to the case-1, we conclude that

$$|c_2|^2 - |c_3|^2 \leq (\binom{4}{2} + \binom{4}{3})(\binom{4}{2} - \binom{4}{3}).$$

Case-4: $\{|P_1^3|^2 > |P_2^3|^2, |P_2^3|^2 < |P_3^3|^2, 2 \operatorname{Re} z_4(\bar{P}_2^3 P_1^3 - \bar{P}_3^3 P_2^3) < 0\}$:

Since $|P_1^3|^2 > |P_2^3|^2, |P_2^3|^2 < |P_3^3|^2, 2 \operatorname{Re} z_4(\bar{P}_2^3 P_1^3 - \bar{P}_3^3 P_2^3) < 0$, from Equation 2.5, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |c_2|^2 - |c_3|^2 &\leq (|P_1^3|^2 - |P_3^3|^2) \\ &\leq \left(\binom{4}{2} + \binom{4}{3}\right) \left(\binom{4}{2} - \binom{4}{3}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Case-5: $\{ |P_1^3|^2 < |P_2^3|^2, |P_2^3|^2 > |P_3^3|^2, 2 \operatorname{Re} z_4(\bar{P}_2^3 P_1^3 - \bar{P}_3^3 P_2^3) > 0 \}$:

Since $|P_1^3|^2 < |P_2^3|^2, |P_2^3|^2 > |P_3^3|^2, 2 \operatorname{Re} z_4(\bar{P}_2^3 P_1^3 - \bar{P}_3^3 P_2^3) > 0$, from Equation 2.5, we have

$$|c_2|^2 - |c_3|^2 \leq (|P_2^3|^2 - |P_3^3|^2) + 2 \operatorname{Re} z_4(\bar{P}_2^3 P_1^3 - \bar{P}_3^3 P_2^3).$$

First we will prove that $|P_2^3|^2 - |P_3^3|^2 \leq 8$. Now, we get

$$\begin{aligned} |P_2^3|^2 - |P_3^3|^2 &\leq |z_1 z_2 + z_1 z_3 + z_2 z_3|^2 - |z_1 z_2 z_3|^2 \\ &\leq (|z_1 z_2| + |z_1 z_3| + |z_2 z_3| + |z_1 z_2 z_3|)(|z_1 z_2| + |z_1 z_3| + |z_2 z_3| - |z_1 z_2 z_3|) \text{ as } |z_2| \leq 1 \\ &\leq 4(|z_1 z_2| + |z_1 z_3| + |z_3| - |z_1 z_2 z_3|) \\ &\leq 4(|z_1 z_3| + |z_3|) \\ &\leq 8. \end{aligned}$$

Also since $2 \operatorname{Re} z_4(\bar{P}_2^3 P_1^3 - \bar{P}_3^3 P_2^3) > 0$, similar to the case-1, we conclude that

$$2 \operatorname{Re} z_4(\bar{P}_2^3 P_1^3 - \bar{P}_3^3 P_2^3) \leq 2 \left(\binom{3}{2} \binom{3}{1} - \binom{3}{3} \binom{3}{2}\right).$$

Combining this, we have

$$|c_2|^2 - |c_3|^2 \leq \left(\binom{4}{2} + \binom{4}{3}\right) \left(\binom{4}{2} - \binom{4}{3}\right).$$

Case-6: $\{ |P_1^3|^2 < |P_2^3|^2, |P_2^3|^2 > |P_3^3|^2, 2 \operatorname{Re} z_4(\bar{P}_2^3 P_1^3 - \bar{P}_3^3 P_2^3) > 0 \}$:

Since $|P_1^3|^2 < |P_2^3|^2, |P_2^3|^2 > |P_3^3|^2, 2 \operatorname{Re} z_4(\bar{P}_2^3 P_1^3 - \bar{P}_3^3 P_2^3) > 0$, from Equation 2.5, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |c_2|^2 - |c_3|^2 &\leq (|P_2^3|^2 - |P_3^3|^2) \\ &\leq \left(\binom{4}{2} + \binom{4}{3}\right) \left(\binom{4}{2} - \binom{4}{3}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Case-7: $\{ |P_1^3|^2 < |P_2^3|^2, |P_2^3|^2 < |P_3^3|^2, 2 \operatorname{Re} z_4(\bar{P}_2^3 P_1^3 - \bar{P}_3^3 P_2^3) > 0 \}$:

Since $|P_1^3|^2 < |P_2^3|^2, |P_2^3|^2 < |P_3^3|^2, 2 \operatorname{Re} z_4(\bar{P}_2^3 P_1^3 - \bar{P}_3^3 P_2^3) > 0$, from Equation 2.5, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |c_2|^2 - |c_3|^2 &\leq 2 \operatorname{Re} z_4(\bar{P}_2^3 P_1^3 - \bar{P}_3^3 P_2^3) \\ &\leq \left(\binom{4}{2} + \binom{4}{3}\right) \left(\binom{4}{2} - \binom{4}{3}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Case-8: $\{ |P_1^3|^2 < |P_2^3|^2, |P_2^3|^2 < |P_3^3|^2, 2 \operatorname{Re} z_4(\bar{P}_2^3 P_1^3 - \bar{P}_3^3 P_2^3) < 0 \}$:

Since $|P_1^3|^2 < |P_2^3|^2, |P_2^3|^2 < |P_3^3|^2, 2 \operatorname{Re} z_4(\bar{P}_2^3 P_1^3 - \bar{P}_3^3 P_2^3) < 0$, from Equation 2.5, we have

$$|c_2|^2 - |c_3|^2 \leq \left(\binom{4}{2} + \binom{4}{3}\right) \left(\binom{4}{2} - \binom{4}{3}\right).$$

Combining all cases, we conclude that

$$|c_2|^2 - |c_3|^2 \leq \left(\binom{4}{2} + \binom{4}{3}\right) \left(\binom{4}{2} - \binom{4}{3}\right).$$

Hence, the result is true for $n = 5$.

Suppose the result is true for $n - 2$, that is,

$$|c_i|^2 - |c_{n-1-i}|^2 \leq \left(\binom{n-2}{i} + \binom{n-2}{n-i-1}\right) \left(\binom{n-2}{i} - \binom{n-2}{n-i-1}\right) \text{ for all } i \text{ with } n-1 > 2i.$$

We wish to show that the result is true for $n - 1$. Similar to the case $n = 2, 3, 4, 5$, one can easily verify that

$$|c_1|^2 - |c_{n-1}|^2 \leq \left(\binom{n-1}{1} + \binom{n-1}{n-1}\right) \left(\binom{n-1}{1} - \binom{n-1}{n-1}\right).$$

Now, for all $i \geq 2$ with $n > 2i$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|c_i|^2 - |c_{n-i}|^2 &= |P_i^{n-2} + z_{n-1}P_{i-1}^{n-2}|^2 - |P_{n-i}^{n-2} + z_{n-1}P_{n-i-1}^{n-2}|^2 \\
&= |P_i^{n-2}|^2 + |z_{n-1}P_{i-1}^{n-2}|^2 + 2\operatorname{Re} \bar{P}_i^{n-2} z_{n-1} P_{i-1}^{n-2} - |P_{n-i}^{n-2}|^2 - |z_{n-1}P_{n-i-1}^{n-2}|^2 - 2\operatorname{Re} \bar{P}_{n-i}^{n-2} z_{n-1} P_{n-i-1}^{n-2} \\
&= (|P_i^{n-2}|^2 - |P_{n-i}^{n-2}|^2) + |z_{n-1}|^2 (|P_{i-1}^{n-2}|^2 - |P_{n-i-1}^{n-2}|^2) \\
&\quad + 2\operatorname{Re} z_{n-1} (\bar{P}_i^{n-2} P_{i-1}^{n-2} - \bar{P}_{n-i}^{n-2} P_{n-i-1}^{n-2})
\end{aligned} \tag{2.8}$$

The proof of this theorem involve the following cases.

Case-1: $\{|P_i^{n-2}|^2 > |P_{n-i}^{n-2}|^2, |P_{i-1}^{n-2}|^2 > |P_{n-i-1}^{n-2}|^2, \operatorname{Re} z_{n-1} (\bar{P}_i^{n-2} P_{i-1}^{n-2} - \bar{P}_{n-i}^{n-2} P_{n-i-1}^{n-2}) > 0\}$:

Since $|P_i^{n-2}|^2 > |P_{n-i}^{n-2}|^2, |P_{i-1}^{n-2}|^2 > |P_{n-i-1}^{n-2}|^2, \operatorname{Re} z_{n-1} (\bar{P}_i^{n-2} P_{i-1}^{n-2} - \bar{P}_{n-i}^{n-2} P_{n-i-1}^{n-2}) > 0$, from Equation 2.8 we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|c_i|^2 - |c_{n-i}|^2 &\leq (|P_i^{n-2}|^2 - |P_{n-i}^{n-2}|^2) + (|P_{i-1}^{n-2}|^2 - |P_{n-i-1}^{n-2}|^2) + 2\operatorname{Re} z_{n-1} (\bar{P}_i^{n-2} P_{i-1}^{n-2} - \bar{P}_{n-i}^{n-2} P_{n-i-1}^{n-2}) \\
&\leq \left(\binom{n-2}{i}^2 - \binom{n-2}{n-i-1}^2 \right) + \left(\binom{n-2}{i-1}^2 - \binom{n-2}{n-i}^2 \right) \\
&\quad + 2\operatorname{Re} z_{n-1} (\bar{P}_i^{n-2} P_{i-1}^{n-2} - \bar{P}_{n-i}^{n-2} P_{n-i-1}^{n-2})
\end{aligned} \tag{2.9}$$

To prove this we will first prove that

$$2\operatorname{Re} z_{n-1} (\bar{P}_i^{n-2} P_{i-1}^{n-2} - \bar{P}_{n-i}^{n-2} P_{n-i-1}^{n-2}) \leq 2 \left(\binom{n-2}{i} \binom{n-2}{i-1} - \binom{n-2}{n-i} \binom{n-2}{n-i-1} \right)$$

for all i with $n-i > i$.

We will also prove it by induction on n . Suppose the result is true for $n-1$, that is,

$$2\operatorname{Re} z (\bar{P}_i^{n-3} P_{i-1}^{n-3} - \bar{P}_{n-i-1}^{n-3} P_{n-i-2}^{n-3}) \leq 2 \left(\binom{n-3}{i} \binom{n-3}{i-1} - \binom{n-3}{n-i-1} \binom{n-3}{n-i-2} \right)$$

for all i with $n-i-1 > i$ and for all $z \in \mathbb{C}$ with $|z| \leq 1$.

$$\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{Re} z_{n-1} \{ \bar{P}_i^{n-2} P_{i-1}^{n-2} - \bar{P}_{n-i}^{n-2} P_{n-i-1}^{n-2} \} &= \operatorname{Re} z_{n-1} \{ (\bar{P}_i^{n-3} P_{i-1}^{n-3} - \bar{P}_{n-i}^{n-3} P_{n-i-1}^{n-3}) + \bar{z}_{n-2} (|P_{i-1}^{n-3}|^2 - |P_{n-i-1}^{n-3}|^2) \\
&\quad + z_{n-2} (\bar{P}_i^{n-3} P_{i-2}^{n-3} - \bar{P}_{n-i}^{n-3} P_{n-i-2}^{n-3}) \\
&\quad + |z_{n-2}|^2 (\bar{P}_{i-1}^{n-3} P_{i-2}^{n-3} - \bar{P}_{n-i-1}^{n-3} P_{n-i-2}^{n-3}) \}.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.10}$$

Since $\operatorname{Re} z_{n-1} \{ \bar{P}_i^{n-2} P_{i-1}^{n-2} - \bar{P}_{n-i}^{n-2} P_{n-i-1}^{n-2} \} > 0$, from Equation 2.10 it follows that real part of all term can not be negative. Now we will consider the following sub-cases.

Sub-case-1: $\{\operatorname{Re} z_{n-1} (\bar{P}_i^{n-3} P_{i-1}^{n-3} - \bar{P}_{n-i}^{n-3} P_{n-i-1}^{n-3}) > 0, |P_{i-1}^{n-3}|^2 > |P_{n-i-1}^{n-3}|^2, \operatorname{Re} z_{n-1} z_{n-2} (\bar{P}_i^{n-3} P_{i-2}^{n-3} - \bar{P}_{n-i}^{n-3} P_{n-i-2}^{n-3}) > 0, \operatorname{Re} z_{n-1} (\bar{P}_{i-1}^{n-3} P_{i-2}^{n-3} - \bar{P}_{n-i-1}^{n-3} P_{n-i-2}^{n-3}) > 0\}$

Since $\operatorname{Re} z_{n-1} (\bar{P}_i^{n-3} P_{i-1}^{n-3} - \bar{P}_{n-i}^{n-3} P_{n-i-1}^{n-3}) > 0, |P_{i-1}^{n-3}|^2 > |P_{n-i-1}^{n-3}|^2, \operatorname{Re} z_{n-1} z_{n-2} (\bar{P}_i^{n-3} P_{i-2}^{n-3} - \bar{P}_{n-i}^{n-3} P_{n-i-2}^{n-3}) > 0, \operatorname{Re} z_{n-1} (\bar{P}_{i-1}^{n-3} P_{i-2}^{n-3} - \bar{P}_{n-i-1}^{n-3} P_{n-i-2}^{n-3}) > 0$, from Equation 2.10, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{Re} z_{n-1} \{ \bar{P}_i^{n-2} P_{i-1}^{n-2} - \bar{P}_{n-i}^{n-2} P_{n-i-1}^{n-2} \} &\leq \operatorname{Re} z_{n-1} \{ (\bar{P}_i^{n-3} P_{i-1}^{n-3} - \bar{P}_{n-i}^{n-3} P_{n-i-1}^{n-3}) + \bar{z}_{n-2} (|P_{i-1}^{n-3}|^2 - |P_{n-i-1}^{n-3}|^2) \\
&\quad + z_{n-2} (\bar{P}_i^{n-3} P_{i-2}^{n-3} - \bar{P}_{n-i}^{n-3} P_{n-i-2}^{n-3}) + (\bar{P}_{i-1}^{n-3} P_{i-2}^{n-3} - \bar{P}_{n-i-1}^{n-3} P_{n-i-2}^{n-3}) \} \\
&\leq \left(\binom{n-3}{i} \binom{n-3}{i-1} - \binom{n-3}{n-i-1} \binom{n-3}{n-i-2} \right) + \left(\binom{n-3}{i-1}^2 - \binom{n-3}{n-i-1}^2 \right) \\
&\quad + \operatorname{Re} z_{n-1} z_{n-2} (\bar{P}_i^{n-3} P_{i-2}^{n-3} - \bar{P}_{n-i}^{n-3} P_{n-i-2}^{n-3}) \\
&\quad + \left(\binom{n-3}{i-1} \binom{n-3}{i-2} - \binom{n-3}{n-i-1} \binom{n-3}{n-i-2} \right).
\end{aligned} \tag{2.11}$$

If we can show that $\text{Re } z_{n-1}z_{n-2}(\bar{P}_i^{n-3}P_{i-2}^{n-3} - \bar{P}_{n-i}^{n-3}P_{n-i-2}^{n-3}) \leq \binom{n-3}{i}\binom{n-3}{i-2} - \binom{n-3}{n-i}\binom{n-3}{n-i-2}$, then we are done. Now, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Re } z_{n-1}z_{n-2}(\bar{P}_i^{n-3}P_{i-2}^{n-3} - \bar{P}_{n-i}^{n-3}P_{n-i-2}^{n-3}) &= \text{Re } z_{n-1}z_{n-2}\{(\bar{P}_i^{n-4}P_{i-2}^{n-4} - \bar{P}_{n-i}^{n-4}P_{n-i-2}^{n-4}) + z_{n-3}(\bar{P}_i^{n-4}P_{i-3}^{n-4} - \bar{P}_{n-i}^{n-4}P_{n-i-3}^{n-4}) \\ &\quad + \bar{z}_{n-3}(\bar{P}_{i-1}^{n-4}P_{i-2}^{n-4} - \bar{P}_{n-i-1}^{n-4}P_{n-i-2}^{n-4}) \\ &\quad + |z_{n-3}|^2(\bar{P}_{i-1}^{n-4}P_{i-3}^{n-4} - \bar{P}_{n-i-1}^{n-4}P_{n-i-3}^{n-4})\}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.12)$$

If $\text{Re } z_{n-1}z_{n-2}(\bar{P}_{i-1}^{n-4}P_{i-3}^{n-4} - \bar{P}_{n-i-1}^{n-4}P_{n-i-3}^{n-4}) < 0$, then from Equation 2.14 we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Re } z_{n-1}z_{n-2}(\bar{P}_i^{n-3}P_{i-2}^{n-3} - \bar{P}_{n-i}^{n-3}P_{n-i-2}^{n-3}) &= \text{Re } z_{n-1}z_{n-2}\{(\bar{P}_i^{n-4}P_{i-2}^{n-4} - \bar{P}_{n-i}^{n-4}P_{n-i-2}^{n-4}) + z_{n-3}(\bar{P}_i^{n-4}P_{i-3}^{n-4} - \bar{P}_{n-i}^{n-4}P_{n-i-3}^{n-4}) \\ &\quad + \bar{z}_{n-3}(\bar{P}_{i-1}^{n-4}P_{i-2}^{n-4} - \bar{P}_{n-i-1}^{n-4}P_{n-i-2}^{n-4})\}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.13)$$

Since $\text{Re } z_{n-1}z_{n-2}(\bar{P}_i^{n-3}P_{i-2}^{n-3} - \bar{P}_{n-i}^{n-3}P_{n-i-2}^{n-3}) > 0$, from Equation 2.13, it follows that at least one term is positive. We will take this terms and go to next stage. In next stage, for each positive terms we will get four terms.

If $\text{Re } z_{n-1}z_{n-2}(\bar{P}_{i-1}^{n-4}P_{i-3}^{n-4} - \bar{P}_{n-i-1}^{n-4}P_{n-i-3}^{n-4}) > 0$, then from Equation 2.14 we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Re } z_{n-1}z_{n-2}(\bar{P}_i^{n-3}P_{i-2}^{n-3} - \bar{P}_{n-i}^{n-3}P_{n-i-2}^{n-3}) &\leq \text{Re } z_{n-1}z_{n-2}\{(\bar{P}_i^{n-4}P_{i-2}^{n-4} - \bar{P}_{n-i-1}^{n-4}P_{n-i-3}^{n-4}) + z_{n-3}(\bar{P}_i^{n-4}P_{i-3}^{n-4} - \bar{P}_{n-i}^{n-4}P_{n-i-3}^{n-4}) \\ &\quad + \bar{z}_{n-3}(\bar{P}_{i-1}^{n-4}P_{i-2}^{n-4} - \bar{P}_{n-i-1}^{n-4}P_{n-i-2}^{n-4}) \\ &\quad + (\bar{P}_{i-1}^{n-4}P_{i-3}^{n-4} - \bar{P}_{n-i}^{n-4}P_{n-i-2}^{n-4})\}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.14)$$

Similarly, in next stage for each positive terms we will also get four terms. Now we will first consider $i-1 < n-2i$. Proceeding in this way, if we will go to $i-1$ th stage, then we have $\text{Re } z_{n-1} \dots z_{n-i-1}(\bar{P}_i^{n-i}P_1^{n-i} - \bar{P}_{n-i}^{n-i}P_{n-2i+1}^{n-i})$, $\text{Re } z_{n-1}z_{n-2}(\bar{P}_{i-1}^{n-i}P_1^{n-i} - \bar{P}_{n-i}^{n-i}P_{n-2i+2}^{n-i})$ and so on. One can also easily verify that

$$\text{Re } z_{n-1} \dots z_{n-i-1}(\bar{P}_i^{n-i}P_1^{n-i} - \bar{P}_{n-i}^{n-i}P_{n-2i+1}^{n-i}) \leq \binom{n-i}{i}\binom{n-i}{1} - \binom{n-i}{n-i}\binom{n-3}{n-2i+1}$$

and

$$\text{Re } z_{n-1}z_{n-2}(\bar{P}_{i-1}^{n-i}P_1^{n-i} - \bar{P}_{n-i}^{n-i}P_{n-2i+2}^{n-i}) \leq \binom{n-i}{i-1}\binom{n-i}{1} - \binom{n-i}{n-i}\binom{n-3}{n-2i+2}.$$

If we will go further, then we will get that kind of term. Now we will go to $n-2i-1$ th stage, that is, $\text{Re } z_{n-1}(\bar{P}_i^{2i-1}P_{i-2}^{2i-1} - \bar{P}_{i+1}^{2i-1}P_{i-1}^{2i-1})$. Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Re } z_{n-1}z_{n-2}(\bar{P}_i^{2i-1}P_{i-2}^{2i-1} - \bar{P}_{i+1}^{2i-1}P_{i-1}^{2i-1}) &= \text{Re } z_{n-1}z_{n-2}\{(\bar{P}_i^{2i-2}P_{i-2}^{2i-2} - \bar{P}_{i+1}^{2i-2}P_{i-1}^{2i-2}) + z_{2i-1}(\bar{P}_i^{2i-2}P_{i-3}^{2i-2} - \bar{P}_{i+1}^{2i-2}P_{i-2}^{2i-2}) \\ &\quad + \bar{z}_{2i-1}(\bar{P}_{i-1}^{2i-2}P_{i-2}^{2i-2} - \bar{P}_i^{2i-2}P_{i-1}^{2i-2}) \\ &\quad + |z_{2i-1}|^2(\bar{P}_{i-1}^{2i-2}P_{i-3}^{2i-2} - \bar{P}_i^{2i-2}P_{i-2}^{2i-2})\}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.15)$$

From Equation 2.15, we see that if $\text{Re } z_{n-1}z_{n-2}(\bar{P}_{i-1}^{2i-2}P_{i-3}^{2i-2} - \bar{P}_i^{2i-2}P_{i-2}^{2i-2}) > 0$, then we can cancel $\bar{P}_i^{2i-2}P_{i-2}^{2i-2}$ from $\text{Re } z_{n-1}z_{n-2}(\bar{P}_i^{2i-1}P_{i-2}^{2i-1} - \bar{P}_{i+1}^{2i-1}P_{i-1}^{2i-1})$. If $\text{Re } z_{n-1}z_{n-2}(\bar{P}_{i-1}^{2i-2}P_{i-3}^{2i-2} - \bar{P}_i^{2i-2}P_{i-2}^{2i-2}) < 0$ and all other term are positive, then we will go to next step. Proceeding in this way we cancel other term also. If we will go to $n-6$ th stage, then we have $\text{Re } z_{n-1} \dots z_9 \bar{z}_8 \bar{z}_7(\bar{P}_3^4 P_2^4 - \bar{P}_4^4 P_3^4)$ and $\text{Re } z_{n-1} \dots z_9 \bar{z}_8 \bar{z}_7(\bar{P}_2^4 P_1^4 - \bar{P}_4^4 P_3^4)$. Clearly,

$$\text{Re } z_{n-1} \dots z_9 \bar{z}_8 \bar{z}_7(\bar{P}_3^4 P_2^4 - \bar{P}_4^4 P_3^4) \leq \binom{4}{3}\binom{4}{2} - \binom{4}{4}\binom{4}{3}$$

and

$$\text{Re } z_{n-1} \dots z_9 \bar{z}_8 \bar{z}_7(\bar{P}_2^4 P_1^4 - \bar{P}_4^4 P_3^4) \leq \binom{4}{2}\binom{4}{1} - \binom{4}{4}\binom{4}{3}.$$

Now we will go to previous step. Proceeding in this way we conclude that

$$\text{Re } z_{n-1}z_{n-2}(\bar{P}_i^{n-3}P_{i-2}^{n-3} - \bar{P}_{n-i}^{n-3}P_{n-i-2}^{n-3}) \leq \binom{n-3}{i}\binom{n-3}{i-2} - \binom{n-3}{n-i}\binom{n-3}{n-i-2}.$$

Similarly if $i-1 > n-2i$, then we can also prove that

$$\text{Re } z_{n-1}z_{n-2}(\bar{P}_i^{n-3}P_{i-2}^{n-3} - \bar{P}_{n-i}^{n-3}P_{n-i-2}^{n-3}) \leq \binom{n-3}{i}\binom{n-3}{i-2} - \binom{n-3}{n-i}\binom{n-3}{n-i-2}.$$

Therefore, from Equation 2.10, we have

$$2 \operatorname{Re} z_{n-1}(\bar{P}_i^{n-2} P_{i-1}^{n-2} - \bar{P}_{n-i}^{n-2} P_{n-i-1}^{n-2}) \leq 2 \left(\binom{n-2}{i} \binom{n-2}{i-1} - \binom{n-2}{n-i} \binom{n-2}{n-i-1} \right)$$

for all i with $n-i > i$.

Sub-case-2: $\{\operatorname{Re} z_{n-1}(\bar{P}_i^{n-3} P_{i-1}^{n-3} - \bar{P}_{n-i}^{n-3} P_{n-i-1}^{n-3}) > 0, |P_{i-1}^{n-3}|^2 > |P_{n-i-1}^{n-3}|^2, \operatorname{Re} z_{n-1} z_{n-2}(\bar{P}_i^{n-3} P_{i-2}^{n-3} - \bar{P}_{n-i}^{n-3} P_{n-i-2}^{n-3}) > 0, \operatorname{Re} z_{n-1}(\bar{P}_{i-1}^{n-3} P_{i-2}^{n-3} - \bar{P}_{n-i-1}^{n-3} P_{n-i-2}^{n-3}) < 0 : \}$

Since $\operatorname{Re} z_{n-1}(\bar{P}_i^{n-3} P_{i-1}^{n-3} - \bar{P}_{n-i}^{n-3} P_{n-i-1}^{n-3}) > 0, |P_{i-1}^{n-3}|^2 > |P_{n-i-1}^{n-3}|^2, \operatorname{Re} z_{n-1} z_{n-2}(\bar{P}_i^{n-3} P_{i-2}^{n-3} - \bar{P}_{n-i}^{n-3} P_{n-i-2}^{n-3}) > 0, \operatorname{Re} z_{n-1}(\bar{P}_{i-1}^{n-3} P_{i-2}^{n-3} - \bar{P}_{n-i-1}^{n-3} P_{n-i-2}^{n-3}) < 0$, from Equation 2.10, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{Re} z_{n-1} \{ \bar{P}_i^{n-2} P_{i-1}^{n-2} - \bar{P}_{n-i}^{n-2} P_{n-i-1}^{n-2} \} &\leq \operatorname{Re} z_{n-1} \{ (\bar{P}_i^{n-3} P_{i-1}^{n-3} - \bar{P}_{n-i}^{n-3} P_{n-i-1}^{n-3}) + \bar{z}_{n-2} (|P_{i-1}^{n-3}|^2 - |P_{n-i-1}^{n-3}|^2) \\ &\quad + z_{n-2} (\bar{P}_i^{n-3} P_{i-2}^{n-3} - \bar{P}_{n-i}^{n-3} P_{n-i-2}^{n-3}) \} \\ &\leq \operatorname{Re} z_{n-1} (\bar{P}_i^{n-3} P_{i-1}^{n-3} - \bar{P}_{n-i}^{n-3} P_{n-i-1}^{n-3}) + \left(\binom{n-3}{i-1}^2 - \binom{n-3}{n-i-1}^2 \right) \\ &\quad + \operatorname{Re} z_{n-1} z_{n-2} (\bar{P}_i^{n-3} P_{i-2}^{n-3} - \bar{P}_{n-i}^{n-3} P_{n-i-2}^{n-3}). \end{aligned}$$

Similar to the Sub-case-1, we can easily verify that

$$\operatorname{Re} z_{n-1} (\bar{P}_i^{n-3} P_{i-1}^{n-3} - \bar{P}_{n-i}^{n-3} P_{n-i-1}^{n-3}) \leq \left(\binom{n-3}{i} \binom{n-3}{i-1} - \binom{n-3}{n-i} \binom{n-3}{n-i-1} \right).$$

Therefore, from Equation 2.10, we conclude that

$$2 \operatorname{Re} z_{n-1}(\bar{P}_i^{n-2} P_{i-1}^{n-2} - \bar{P}_{n-i}^{n-2} P_{n-i-1}^{n-2}) \leq 2 \left(\binom{n-2}{i} \binom{n-2}{i-1} - \binom{n-2}{n-i} \binom{n-2}{n-i-1} \right)$$

for all i with $n-i > i$.

Sub-case-3: $\{\operatorname{Re} z_{n-1}(\bar{P}_i^{n-3} P_{i-1}^{n-3} - \bar{P}_{n-i}^{n-3} P_{n-i-1}^{n-3}) > 0, |P_{i-1}^{n-3}|^2 > |P_{n-i-1}^{n-3}|^2, \operatorname{Re} z_{n-1} z_{n-2}(\bar{P}_i^{n-3} P_{i-2}^{n-3} - \bar{P}_{n-i}^{n-3} P_{n-i-2}^{n-3}) < 0, \operatorname{Re} z_{n-1}(\bar{P}_{i-1}^{n-3} P_{i-2}^{n-3} - \bar{P}_{n-i-1}^{n-3} P_{n-i-2}^{n-3}) < 0 : \}$

Since $\operatorname{Re} z_{n-1}(\bar{P}_i^{n-3} P_{i-1}^{n-3} - \bar{P}_{n-i}^{n-3} P_{n-i-1}^{n-3}) > 0, |P_{i-1}^{n-3}|^2 > |P_{n-i-1}^{n-3}|^2, \operatorname{Re} z_{n-1} z_{n-2}(\bar{P}_i^{n-3} P_{i-2}^{n-3} - \bar{P}_{n-i}^{n-3} P_{n-i-2}^{n-3}) < 0, \operatorname{Re} z_{n-1}(\bar{P}_{i-1}^{n-3} P_{i-2}^{n-3} - \bar{P}_{n-i-1}^{n-3} P_{n-i-2}^{n-3}) < 0$, from Equation 2.10, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{Re} z_{n-1} \{ \bar{P}_i^{n-2} P_{i-1}^{n-2} - \bar{P}_{n-i}^{n-2} P_{n-i-1}^{n-2} \} &\leq \operatorname{Re} z_{n-1} \{ (\bar{P}_i^{n-3} P_{i-1}^{n-3} - \bar{P}_{n-i}^{n-3} P_{n-i-1}^{n-3}) + \bar{z}_{n-2} (|P_{i-1}^{n-3}|^2 - |P_{n-i-1}^{n-3}|^2) \\ &\leq \operatorname{Re} z_{n-1} (\bar{P}_i^{n-3} P_{i-1}^{n-3} - \bar{P}_{n-i}^{n-3} P_{n-i-1}^{n-3}) + \left(\binom{n-3}{i-1}^2 - \binom{n-3}{n-i-1}^2 \right) \\ &\leq \left(\binom{n-2}{i} \binom{n-2}{i-1} - \binom{n-2}{n-i} \binom{n-2}{n-i-1} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Sub-case-4: $\{\operatorname{Re} z_{n-1}(\bar{P}_i^{n-3} P_{i-1}^{n-3} - \bar{P}_{n-i}^{n-3} P_{n-i-1}^{n-3}) > 0, |P_{i-1}^{n-3}|^2 < |P_{n-i-1}^{n-3}|^2, \operatorname{Re} z_{n-1} z_{n-2}(\bar{P}_i^{n-3} P_{i-2}^{n-3} - \bar{P}_{n-i}^{n-3} P_{n-i-2}^{n-3}) > 0, \operatorname{Re} z_{n-1}(\bar{P}_{i-1}^{n-3} P_{i-2}^{n-3} - \bar{P}_{n-i-1}^{n-3} P_{n-i-2}^{n-3}) > 0 : \}$

Since $\operatorname{Re} z_{n-1}(\bar{P}_i^{n-3} P_{i-1}^{n-3} - \bar{P}_{n-i}^{n-3} P_{n-i-1}^{n-3}) > 0, |P_{i-1}^{n-3}|^2 < |P_{n-i-1}^{n-3}|^2, \operatorname{Re} z_{n-1} z_{n-2}(\bar{P}_i^{n-3} P_{i-2}^{n-3} - \bar{P}_{n-i}^{n-3} P_{n-i-2}^{n-3}) > 0, \operatorname{Re} z_{n-1}(\bar{P}_{i-1}^{n-3} P_{i-2}^{n-3} - \bar{P}_{n-i-1}^{n-3} P_{n-i-2}^{n-3}) > 0$, from Equation 2.10, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{Re} z_{n-1} \{ \bar{P}_i^{n-2} P_{i-1}^{n-2} - \bar{P}_{n-i}^{n-2} P_{n-i-1}^{n-2} \} &\leq \operatorname{Re} z_{n-1} \{ (\bar{P}_i^{n-3} P_{i-1}^{n-3} - \bar{P}_{n-i}^{n-3} P_{n-i-1}^{n-3}) \\ &\quad + z_{n-2} (\bar{P}_i^{n-3} P_{i-2}^{n-3} - \bar{P}_{n-i}^{n-3} P_{n-i-2}^{n-3}) + (\bar{P}_{i-1}^{n-3} P_{i-2}^{n-3} - \bar{P}_{n-i-1}^{n-3} P_{n-i-2}^{n-3}) \} \\ &\leq \left(\binom{n-3}{i} \binom{n-3}{i-1} - \binom{n-3}{n-i-1} \binom{n-3}{n-i-2} \right) \\ &\quad + \operatorname{Re} z_{n-1} z_{n-2} (\bar{P}_i^{n-3} P_{i-2}^{n-3} - \bar{P}_{n-i}^{n-3} P_{n-i-2}^{n-3}) \\ &\quad + \left(\binom{n-3}{i-1} \binom{n-3}{i-2} - \binom{n-3}{n-i} \binom{n-3}{n-i-1} \right). \end{aligned} \tag{2.16}$$

Since $\operatorname{Re} z_{n-1} z_{n-2} (\bar{P}_i^{n-3} P_{i-2}^{n-3} - \bar{P}_{n-i}^{n-3} P_{n-i-2}^{n-3}) \leq \binom{n-3}{i} \binom{n-3}{i-2} - \binom{n-3}{n-i} \binom{n-3}{n-i-2}$, we have we have

$$2 \operatorname{Re} z_{n-1}(\bar{P}_i^{n-2} P_{i-1}^{n-2} - \bar{P}_{n-i}^{n-2} P_{n-i-1}^{n-2}) \leq 2 \left(\binom{n-2}{i} \binom{n-2}{i-1} - \binom{n-2}{n-i} \binom{n-2}{n-i-1} \right)$$

Case-2: $\{|P_i^{n-2}|^2 > |P_{n-i}^{n-2}|^2, |P_{i-1}^{n-2}|^2 > |P_{n-i-1}^{n-2}|^2, \operatorname{Re} z_{n-1}(\bar{P}_i^{n-2} P_{i-1}^{n-2} - \bar{P}_{n-i}^{n-2} P_{n-i-1}^{n-2}) < 0\}$:

Since $|P_i^{n-2}|^2 > |P_{n-i}^{n-2}|^2, |P_{i-1}^{n-2}|^2 > |P_{n-i-1}^{n-2}|^2, \operatorname{Re} z_{n-1}(\bar{P}_i^{n-2} P_{i-1}^{n-2} - \bar{P}_{n-i}^{n-2} P_{n-i-1}^{n-2}) < 0$, from Equation 2.8 we have

$$|c_i|^2 - |c_{n-i}|^2 \leq \left(\binom{n-1}{i} + \binom{n-1}{n-i}\right) \left(\binom{n-1}{i} - \binom{n-1}{n-i}\right) \text{ for all } i \text{ with } n-i > i.$$

Case-3: $\{|P_i^{n-2}|^2 < |P_{n-i}^{n-2}|^2, |P_{i-1}^{n-2}|^2 > |P_{n-i-1}^{n-2}|^2, \operatorname{Re} z_{n-1}(\bar{P}_i^{n-2} P_{i-1}^{n-2} - \bar{P}_{n-i}^{n-2} P_{n-i-1}^{n-2}) > 0\}$:

Since $|P_i^{n-2}|^2 < |P_{n-i}^{n-2}|^2, |P_{i-1}^{n-2}|^2 > |P_{n-i-1}^{n-2}|^2, \operatorname{Re} z_{n-1}(\bar{P}_i^{n-2} P_{i-1}^{n-2} - \bar{P}_{n-i}^{n-2} P_{n-i-1}^{n-2}) > 0$, from Equation 2.8 we have

$$|c_i|^2 - |c_{n-i}|^2 \leq \left(\binom{n-1}{i} + \binom{n-1}{n-i}\right) \left(\binom{n-1}{i} - \binom{n-1}{n-i}\right) \text{ for all } i \text{ with } n-i > i.$$

Case-4: $\{|P_i^{n-2}|^2 < |P_{n-i}^{n-2}|^2, |P_{i-1}^{n-2}|^2 > |P_{n-i-1}^{n-2}|^2, \operatorname{Re} z_{n-1}(\bar{P}_i^{n-2} P_{i-1}^{n-2} - \bar{P}_{n-i}^{n-2} P_{n-i-1}^{n-2}) < 0\}$:

Since $|P_i^{n-2}|^2 < |P_{n-i}^{n-2}|^2, |P_{i-1}^{n-2}|^2 > |P_{n-i-1}^{n-2}|^2, \operatorname{Re} z_{n-1}(\bar{P}_i^{n-2} P_{i-1}^{n-2} - \bar{P}_{n-i}^{n-2} P_{n-i-1}^{n-2}) < 0$, from Equation 2.8 we have

$$|c_i|^2 - |c_{n-i}|^2 \leq \left(\binom{n-1}{i} + \binom{n-1}{n-i}\right) \left(\binom{n-1}{i} - \binom{n-1}{n-i}\right) \text{ for all } i \text{ with } n-i > i.$$

Case-5: $\{|P_i^{n-2}|^2 > |P_{n-i}^{n-2}|^2, |P_{i-1}^{n-2}|^2 < |P_{n-i-1}^{n-2}|^2, \operatorname{Re} z_{n-1}(\bar{P}_i^{n-2} P_{i-1}^{n-2} - \bar{P}_{n-i}^{n-2} P_{n-i-1}^{n-2}) > 0\}$:

Since $|P_i^{n-2}|^2 > |P_{n-i}^{n-2}|^2, |P_{i-1}^{n-2}|^2 < |P_{n-i-1}^{n-2}|^2, \operatorname{Re} z_{n-1}(\bar{P}_i^{n-2} P_{i-1}^{n-2} - \bar{P}_{n-i}^{n-2} P_{n-i-1}^{n-2}) > 0$, from Equation 2.8 we have

$$|c_i|^2 - |c_{n-i}|^2 \leq (|P_i^{n-2}|^2 - |P_{n-i}^{n-2}|^2) + 2 \operatorname{Re} z_{n-1}(\bar{P}_i^{n-2} P_{i-1}^{n-2} - \bar{P}_{n-i}^{n-2} P_{n-i-1}^{n-2})$$

Similar to the sub-case-1 of case-1, one can easily verify that

$$(|P_i^{n-2}|^2 - |P_{n-i}^{n-2}|^2) \leq \left(\binom{n-2}{i} + \binom{n-2}{n-i}\right) \left(\binom{n-1}{i} - \binom{n-1}{n-i}\right) \text{ for all } i \text{ with } n-i > i.$$

Therefore from Equation 2.8, we conclude that

$$|c_i|^2 - |c_{n-i}|^2 \leq \left(\binom{n-1}{i} + \binom{n-1}{n-i}\right) \left(\binom{n-1}{i} - \binom{n-1}{n-i}\right) \text{ for all } i \text{ with } n-i > i.$$

Case-6: $\{|P_i^{n-2}|^2 > |P_{n-i}^{n-2}|^2, |P_{i-1}^{n-2}|^2 < |P_{n-i-1}^{n-2}|^2, \operatorname{Re} z_{n-1}(\bar{P}_i^{n-2} P_{i-1}^{n-2} - \bar{P}_{n-i}^{n-2} P_{n-i-1}^{n-2}) < 0\}$:

Since $|P_i^{n-2}|^2 > |P_{n-i}^{n-2}|^2, |P_{i-1}^{n-2}|^2 < |P_{n-i-1}^{n-2}|^2, \operatorname{Re} z_{n-1}(\bar{P}_i^{n-2} P_{i-1}^{n-2} - \bar{P}_{n-i}^{n-2} P_{n-i-1}^{n-2}) < 0$, therefore similar to case-5 we also conclude that

$$|c_i|^2 - |c_{n-i}|^2 \leq \left(\binom{n-1}{i} + \binom{n-1}{n-i}\right) \left(\binom{n-1}{i} - \binom{n-1}{n-i}\right) \text{ for all } i \text{ with } n-i > i.$$

Case-7: $\{|P_i^{n-2}|^2 < |P_{n-i}^{n-2}|^2, |P_{i-1}^{n-2}|^2 < |P_{n-i-1}^{n-2}|^2, \operatorname{Re} z_{n-1}(\bar{P}_i^{n-2} P_{i-1}^{n-2} - \bar{P}_{n-i}^{n-2} P_{n-i-1}^{n-2}) > 0\}$:

Since $|P_i^{n-2}|^2 < |P_{n-i}^{n-2}|^2, |P_{i-1}^{n-2}|^2 < |P_{n-i-1}^{n-2}|^2, \operatorname{Re} z_{n-1}(\bar{P}_i^{n-2} P_{i-1}^{n-2} - \bar{P}_{n-i}^{n-2} P_{n-i-1}^{n-2}) > 0$, from Equation 2.8 we have

$$|c_i|^2 - |c_{n-i}|^2 \leq \left(\binom{n-1}{i} + \binom{n-1}{n-i}\right) \left(\binom{n-1}{i} - \binom{n-1}{n-i}\right) \text{ for all } i \text{ with } n-i > i.$$

Case-8: $\{|P_i^{n-2}|^2 < |P_{n-i}^{n-2}|^2, |P_{i-1}^{n-2}|^2 < |P_{n-i-1}^{n-2}|^2, \operatorname{Re} z_{n-1}(\bar{P}_i^{n-2} P_{i-1}^{n-2} - \bar{P}_{n-i}^{n-2} P_{n-i-1}^{n-2}) < 0\}$:

Since $|P_i^{n-2}|^2 < |P_{n-i}^{n-2}|^2, |P_{i-1}^{n-2}|^2 < |P_{n-i-1}^{n-2}|^2, \operatorname{Re} z_{n-1}(\bar{P}_i^{n-2} P_{i-1}^{n-2} - \bar{P}_{n-i}^{n-2} P_{n-i-1}^{n-2}) < 0$, from Equation 2.8 we have

$$|c_i|^2 - |c_{n-i}|^2 \leq \left(\binom{n-1}{i} + \binom{n-1}{n-i}\right) \left(\binom{n-1}{i} - \binom{n-1}{n-i}\right) \text{ for all } i \text{ with } n-i > i.$$

This completes the proof. $\square$

Theorem 2.3. Suppose $(s_1, \dots, s_m, s_{m+1}, \dots, s_{n-1}, p) \in \mathbb{C}^n, n \geq 3$. Then the following conditions are equivalent:

- (1) $(s_1, \dots, s_m, s_{m+1}, \dots, s_{n-1}, p) \in \Gamma_n$,
- (2) $(s_{n-1}, \dots, s_{m+1}, s_m, \dots, s_1, p) \in \Gamma_n$,
- (3) Γ_n is a complete spectral set for $(s_1, \dots, s_m, s_{m+1}, \dots, s_{n-1}, p)$,

(4)

$$\Phi_{1k(i)}^{(i)}(\alpha^i s_i, \alpha^{n-i} s_{n-i}, \alpha^n p) \geq 0$$

and

$$\Phi_{2k(i)}^{(i)}(\alpha^i s_i, \alpha^{n-i} s_{n-i}, \alpha^n p) \geq 0$$

for all $\alpha \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}$ with $k(i) \geq (|c_i| + |c_{n-i}|)$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$,

(5)

$$|k(i)\alpha^n p - \alpha^{n-i} s_{n-i}| \leq |k(i) - \alpha^i s_i|$$

and

$$|k(i)\alpha^n p - \alpha^i s_i| \leq |k(i) - \alpha^{n-i} s_{n-i}|$$

with $k(i) \geq (|c_i| + |c_{n-i}|)$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$,(6) $|s_i - \bar{s}_{n-i}p| + |s_{n-i} - \bar{s}_i p| \leq \left(\binom{n-1}{i} + \binom{n-1}{n-i}\right)(1 - |p|^2)$, for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$,(7) $|p| \leq 1$ and there exist complex numbers c_i and c_{n-i} with $|c_i| + |c_{n-i}| \leq \binom{n-1}{i} + \binom{n-1}{n-i}$ such that $s_i = c_i + \bar{c}_{n-i}p$ and $s_{n-i} = c_{n-i} + \bar{c}_i p$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$.

Proof. Clearly, (1) implies (3). The proof that (3) implies (1) is also easy. To prove (1) implies (7), let $(s_1, \dots, s_m, s_{m+1}, \dots, s_{n-1}, p) \in \Gamma_n$. Then there are complex numbers $z_1, \dots, z_n \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}$ such that for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$, $s_i = \sum_{1 \leq k_1 < \dots < k_i \leq n-1} z_{k_1} \dots z_{k_i}$ and $p = \prod_{i=1}^n z_i$.

If $|p| = 1$, then by Theorem 2.1, we have $s_i = c_i + \bar{c}_{n-i}p$, $s_{n-i} = c_{n-i} + \bar{c}_i p$, for some choice c_i, c_{n-i} with $|c_i| + |c_{n-i}| \leq \binom{n-1}{i} + \binom{n-1}{n-i}$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$. If $|p| < 1$, we consider the polynomial

$$f(z) = z^n - s_1 z^{n-1} + \dots + (-1)^m s_m z^m + (-1)^{m+1} s_{m+1} z^{m+1} + \dots + (-1)^{n-1} s_{n-1} z + (-1)^n p$$

and

$$f_1 = z^{n-1} - c_1 z^{n-2} + \dots + (-1)^m c_m z^m + (-1)^{m+1} c_{m+1} z^{m+1} + \dots + (-1)^{n-1} c_{n-1}.$$

We will show that if the zeros of f lie in $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$, then the zeros of f_1 also lie in $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$. Now,

$$\begin{aligned} f(z) &= z^n - s_1 z^{n-1} + \dots + (-1)^m s_m z^m + (-1)^{m+1} s_{m+1} z^{m+1} \\ &\quad + \dots + (-1)^{n-1} s_{n-1} z + (-1)^n p \\ &= z^n - (c_1 + \bar{c}_{n-1}p) z^{n-1} + \dots + (-1)^m (c_m + \bar{c}_{m+1}p) z^m \\ &\quad + (-1)^{m+1} (c_{m+1} + \bar{c}_m p) z^{m+1} + \dots + (-1)^{n-1} (c_{n-1} + \bar{c}_1 p) z + (-1)^n p \\ &= z f_1(z) - p(\bar{c}_{n-1} z^{n-1} + \dots + (-1)^{m-1} \bar{c}_{m+1} z^m + (-1)^m \bar{c}_m z^{m+1} + \dots - \bar{c}_1 z + 1) \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |f(z) - z f_1| &= |p(\bar{c}_{n-1} z^{n-1} + \dots + (-1)^{m-1} \bar{c}_{m+1} z^m + (-1)^m \bar{c}_m z^{m+1} + \dots - \bar{c}_1 z + 1)| \\ &= |p| |(c_{n-1} \bar{z}^{n-1} + \dots + (-1)^{m-1} c_{m+1} \bar{z}^m + (-1)^m c_m \bar{z}^{m+1} + \dots - c_1 \bar{z} + 1)| \end{aligned} \quad (2.17)$$

Restricting Equation 2.17 on $\mathbb{T}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |f(z) - z f_1| &= |p| |(c_{n-1} \bar{z}^{n-1} + \dots + (-1)^{m-1} c_{m+1} \bar{z}^m + (-1)^m c_m \bar{z}^{m+1} + \dots - c_1 \bar{z} + 1)| \\ &= |p| |z^{n-1} - c_1 z^{n-2} + \dots + (-1)^m c_m z^m + (-1)^{m+1} c_{m+1} z^{m+1} + \dots + (-1)^{n-1} c_{n-1}| \\ &= |p| |f_1(z)| \\ &< |f_1(z)| \end{aligned}$$

So, by Rouché Theorem, we conclude that f and $z f_1$ have the same number of zeros inside $\mathbb{D}$. if $f(w) = 0$ for some $w \in \mathbb{T}$, then from Equation 2.17 we have $|f_1(w)| = |p| |f_1(w)|$. Since $|p| < 1$, from above relation we get $f_1(w) = 0$, which implies that if the zeros of f lie in $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$, then the zeros of f_1 also lie in $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$. Since $(s_1, \dots, s_m, s_{m+1}, \dots, s_{n-1}, p) \in \Gamma_n$, the zeros of f lie in $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$. Therefore, we conclude that the zeros of f_1 also lie in $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$. Hence, there exist $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{n-1} \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}$ such that $c_i = \sum_{1 \leq l_1 < \dots < l_i \leq n-2} \alpha_{l_1} \dots \alpha_{l_i}$ and $c_{n-1} = \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} \alpha_i$. It is also easy to see that $|c_i| + |c_{n-i}| \leq \binom{n-1}{i} + \binom{n-1}{n-i}$.

Now, we will prove (7) implies (3). This implication follows from the result of a subsequent section. From Theorem 6.6, we shall see that if $E_1, \dots, E_{n-1}$ be commuting $n-1$ tuples of bounded operators on $\mathcal{D}_P$ satisfying the following conditions:

- (1) $S_i - S_{n-i}^*P = D_P E_i D_P, S_{n-i} - S_i^*P = D_P E_{n-i} D_P$, for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$;
- (2) $[E_i^*, E_j^*] = 0$ for $i, j = 1, \dots, n-1$;
- (3) $[E_i, E_{n-j}^*] = [E_j, E_{n-i}^*]$ for $i, j = 1, \dots, n-1$,

then Γ_n is a complete spectral set for $(S_1, \dots, S_{n-1}, P)$ provided that $\|S_i\| \leq \binom{n-1}{i} + \binom{n-1}{n-i}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$ and $\|P\| \leq 1$. For the case of scalar if $s_i = c_i + \bar{c}_{n-i}p$ for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$, then $\|s_i\| \leq \binom{n-1}{i} + \binom{n-1}{n-i}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$ and $(c_1, \dots, c_{n-1})$ plays the role of $(E_1, \dots, E_{n-1})$ in Theorem 6.6 to make Γ_n a spectral set for $(s_1, \dots, s_{n-1}, p)$. Hence (7) implies (3). Combining all the above implication, we concluded that (1) $\Rightarrow$ (7) $\Rightarrow$ (3) $\Rightarrow$ (1).

It is very easy to see that (2) is equivalent to (7), because (1) and (7) are equivalent and (7) is symmetric in $s_1, \dots, s_{n-1}$.

To prove (1) implies (4), let $(s_1, \dots, s_m, s_{m+1}, \dots, s_{n-1}, p)$ be a point in Γ_n . Then one can easily see that for any $\alpha \in \mathbb{D}$, $(\alpha s_1, \dots, \alpha^m s_m, \alpha^{m+1} s_{m+1}, \dots, \alpha^{n-1} s_{n-1}, \alpha^n p) \in \mathbb{G}_n$. Consider the polynomial

$$P(z) = z^n - \alpha s_1 z^{n-1} + \dots + (-1)^m \alpha^m s_m z^m + (-1)^{m+1} \alpha^{m+1} s_{m+1} z^{m+1} + \dots + (-1)^n \alpha^n p.$$

Suppose $z_1, z_2, \dots, z_n$ are the roots of the polynomial $P(z) = 0$. Then

$$\alpha^i s_i = \sum_{1 \leq k_1 < \dots < k_i \leq n-1} z_{k_1} \dots z_{k_i}$$

and $\alpha^n p = \prod_{i=1}^n z_i$, for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$. Let S be the $n \times n$ "Shift matrix" which is of the form $S = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \end{pmatrix}$. Then by a simple computation one can show that

$$P(S) = \begin{pmatrix} (-1)^n \alpha^n p & (-1)^{n-1} \alpha^{n-1} s_{n-1} & \dots & \alpha^2 s_2 & -\alpha s_1 \\ 0 & (-1)^n \alpha^n p & \dots & -\alpha^3 s_3 & \alpha^2 s_2 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & (-1)^n \alpha^n p & (-1)^{n-1} \alpha^{n-1} s_{n-1} \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & (-1)^n \alpha^n p \end{pmatrix}$$

and

$$Q(S) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 - \bar{\alpha} \bar{s}_1 & \dots & (-1)^{n-2} \bar{\alpha}^{n-2} \bar{s}_{n-2} & (-1)^{n-1} \bar{\alpha}^{n-1} \bar{s}_{n-1} \\ 0 & 1 & \dots & (-1)^{n-3} \bar{\alpha}^{n-3} \bar{s}_{n-3} & (-1)^{n-2} \bar{\alpha}^{n-2} \bar{s}_{n-2} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & 1 & -\bar{\alpha} \bar{s}_1 \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix},$$

where $Q(z) = z^n \overline{P(\frac{1}{z})}$. Let $L = Q(S)^* Q(S) - P(S)^* P(S)$. Then

$$L = \begin{pmatrix} 1 - |\alpha^n p|^2 & -\bar{\alpha}(\bar{s}_1 - |\alpha^{n-1}|^2 s_{n-1} \bar{p}) & \dots & (-1)^{n-1} \bar{\alpha}^{n-1} (\bar{s}_{n-1} - |\alpha|^2 s_1 \bar{p}) \\ -\alpha(s_1 - |\alpha^{n-1}|^2 \bar{s}_{n-1} p) & (1 - |\alpha^n p|^2) & \dots & (-1)^{n-2} \bar{\alpha}^{n-2} (\bar{s}_{n-2} - |\alpha|^4 s_2 \bar{p}) \\ \vdots & +(|\alpha s_1|^2 - |\alpha^{n-1} s_{n-1}|^2) & \dots & \vdots \\ (-1)^{n-1} \alpha^{n-1} (s_{n-1} - |\alpha|^2 \bar{s}_1 p) & (-1)^{n-2} \alpha^{n-2} (s_{n-2} - |\alpha|^4 \bar{s}_2 p) & \dots & 1 - |\alpha^n p|^2 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$= \begin{pmatrix} 1 - |\alpha^n p|^2 & B_{(1)} \\ B_{(1)}^* & L_{(1)} \end{pmatrix}$$

where $L_{(1)} = \begin{pmatrix} (1 - |\alpha^n p|^2) + (|\alpha s_1|^2 - |\alpha^{n-1} s_{n-1}|^2) & \dots & (-1)^{n-2} \bar{\alpha}^{n-2} (\bar{s}_{n-2} - |\alpha|^4 s_2 \bar{p}) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ (-1)^{n-2} \alpha^{n-2} (s_{n-2} - |\alpha|^4 \bar{s}_2 p) & \dots & 1 - |\alpha^n p|^2 \end{pmatrix}$ and

$$B_{(1)} = (1 - |\alpha^n p|^2 \quad -\bar{\alpha}(\bar{s}_1 - |\alpha^{n-1}|^2 s_{n-1} \bar{p}) \quad \dots \quad (-1)^{n-1} \bar{\alpha}^{n-1} (\bar{s}_{n-1} - |\alpha|^2 s_1 \bar{p})).$$

It is well known that A is positive definite, then all lading principal minors of A are positive [39]. Also any principal sub-matrix of a positive definite matrix is positive definite [39]. By Schur's theorem [61], the matrix L is positive definite. Since L is positive definite, the principal minor

$$S(1, n) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 - |\alpha^n p|^2 & (-1)^{n-1} \bar{\alpha}^{n-1} (\bar{s}_{n-1} - |\alpha|^2 s_1 \bar{p}) \\ (-1)^{n-1} \alpha^{n-1} (s_{n-1} - |\alpha|^2 \bar{s}_1 p) & 1 - |\alpha^n p|^2 \end{pmatrix}$$

is positive definite. The positive definiteness of L also implies that the matrix $L_{(1)}$ is positive. Let $a = 1 - |\alpha^n p|^2$ and $c = (-1)^{n-1} \bar{\alpha}^{n-1} (\bar{s}_{n-1} - |\alpha|^2 s_1 \bar{p})$. The positive definiteness of $S(1, n)$ is equivalent to $\det S(1, n) > 0$ and $a > 0$. Also, the two conditions $\det S(1, n) > 0$ and $a > 0$ together imply that $a > |c|$. Now, we consider two cases.

Case-1: Let $n = 2m + 1$. For this case, we will prove the following inequality for $i = 1, \dots, m$,

$$|\alpha^{n-i} (s_{n-i} - |\alpha|^{2i} \bar{s}_i p)|^2 < \frac{\overbrace{(n-i+1)^2 (n-i+2)^2 \dots (n-1)^2}^{i-1}}{((i-1)!)^2} a^2, \quad (2.18)$$

$$|\alpha^i (s_i - |\alpha|^{2(n-i)} \bar{s}_{n-i} p)|^2 < \frac{\overbrace{(n-i)^2 (n-i+1)^2 (n-i+2)^2 \dots (n-1)^2}^i}{((i)!)^2} a^2. \quad (2.19)$$

for $i = 1, \dots, m + 1$.

To prove this first we will show that

$$|\alpha^i s_i|^2 - |\alpha^{n-i} s_{n-i}|^2 \leq \begin{cases} \frac{n(n-1)^2 \dots (n-i+1)^2 (n-2i)a}{(i!)^2} & \text{if } n > 2i; \\ \frac{n(n-1)^2 \dots (n-i+1)^2 (2i-n)a}{(i!)^2} & \text{if } n < 2i. \end{cases}$$

Let $m(i, n-i) = |\alpha^i s_i|^2 - |\alpha^{n-i} s_{n-i}|^2$. We apply (1) $\Rightarrow$ (7) to get $(c_i, \dots, c_{n-1}) \in \Gamma_{n-1}$ such that

$$\alpha^i s_i = c_i + \bar{c}_{n-i}(\alpha^n p), \alpha^{n-i} s_{n-i} = c_{n-i} + \bar{c}_i(\alpha^n p)$$

for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$. Therefore, for $n > 2i$

$$\begin{aligned} m(i, n-i) &= |\alpha^i s_i|^2 - |\alpha^{n-i} s_{n-i}|^2 \\ &= |c_i + \bar{c}_{n-i}(\alpha^n p)|^2 - |c_{n-i} + \bar{c}_i(\alpha^n p)|^2 \\ &= (|c_i|^2 - |c_{n-i}|^2)(1 - |\alpha^n p|^2) \\ &= (|c_i| + |c_{n-i}|)(|c_i| - |c_{n-i}|)(1 - |\alpha^n p|^2) \\ &\leq \left(\binom{n-1}{i} + \binom{n-1}{n-i} \right) \left(\binom{n-1}{i} - \binom{n-1}{n-i} \right) a \quad (\text{using Lemma 2.2}) \\ &= \left(\frac{\overbrace{(n-1) \dots (n-i+1)(n-2i)}^i}{i!} \right) \left(\frac{\overbrace{n \dots (n-i+1)}^i}{i!} \right) a \\ &= \frac{\overbrace{n(n-1)^2 \dots (n-i+1)^2 (n-2i)}^{i+1}}{(i!)^2} a. \end{aligned} \quad (2.20)$$

Similarly, for $n < 2i$ we also prove that

$$m(n-i, i) \leq \frac{\overbrace{n(n-1)^2 \dots (n-i+1)^2 (2i-n)}^{i+1}}{(i!)^2} a. \quad (2.21)$$

Step by step we will verify the Inequality -2.18 and Inequality- 2.19.

Step-1: For this step we will prove the Inequality -2.18. We proceed by induction on m . For $i = 1$, the result follows from the positivity of $S(1, n) > 0$. Now we will prove for $i = 2$. Since $L_{(1)}$ is positive definite, the principal minor $S(1, n-1) = \begin{pmatrix} 1-|\alpha^n p|^2 + (|\alpha s_1|^2 - |\alpha^{n-1} s_{n-1}|^2) & (-1)^{n-2} \bar{\alpha}^{n-2} (\bar{s}_{n-2} - |\alpha|^4 s_2 \bar{p}) \\ (-1)^{n-2} \alpha^{n-2} (s_{n-2} - |\alpha|^4 \bar{s}_2 p) & 1-|\alpha^n p|^2 \end{pmatrix}$ is positive definite. The positive definiteness of $S(1, n-1)$ is equivalent to

$$|\bar{\alpha}^{n-2} (\bar{s}_{n-2} - |\alpha|^4 s_2 \bar{p})|^2 < a^2 + (|\alpha s_1|^2 - |\alpha^{n-1} s_{n-1}|^2) a.$$

Equivalently,

$$|\bar{\alpha}^{n-2} (\bar{s}_{n-2} - |\alpha|^4 s_2 \bar{p})|^2 < a^2 + n(n-2) = (n-1)^2 a^2.$$

Assuming the truth of Inequality-2.18 for a fixed value of i , we wish to show that it is true with i replaced by $i + 1$. Now,

$$\begin{aligned}
|\alpha^{n-i-1}(s_{n-i-1} - |\alpha|^{2(i+1)}\bar{s}_{i+1}p)|^2 &< \frac{\overbrace{(n-i+1)^2(n-i+2)^2 \dots (n-1)^2}^{i-1} a^2}{((i-1)!)^2} \\
&+ (|\alpha^i s_i|^2 - |\alpha^{n-i} s_{n-i}|^2) \\
&\leq \frac{\overbrace{(n-i+1)^2(n-i+2)^2 \dots (n-1)^2}^{i-1} a^2}{((i)!)^2} (i^2 + n^2 - 2in) \\
&\leq \frac{\overbrace{(n-i)^2(n-i+1)^2(n-i+2)^2 \dots (n-1)^2}^i a^2}{((i)!)^2}
\end{aligned}$$

This completes the induction step.

Step-2: For this step, we will show the Inequality -2.19. We will prove it by induction on m . We can write the matrix L as

$L =$

$$\left[\begin{array}{cc|cc} 1 - |\alpha^n p|^2 & \dots & (-1)^{n-2} \bar{\alpha}^{n-2} (\bar{s}_{n-2} - |\alpha|^4 s_2 \bar{p}) & (-1)^{n-1} \bar{\alpha}^{n-1} (\bar{s}_{n-1} - |\alpha|^2 s_1 \bar{p}) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \hline -\alpha(s_1 - |\alpha^{n-1}|^2 \bar{s}_{n-1} p) & \dots & (1 - |\alpha^n p|^2) & -\bar{\alpha}(\bar{s}_1 - |\alpha|^{2n-2} s_{n-1} \bar{p}) \\ (-1)^{n-1} \alpha^{n-1} (s_{n-1} - |\alpha|^2 \bar{s}_1 p) & \dots & +(|\alpha s_1|^2 - |\alpha^{n-1} s_{n-1}|^2) & -\alpha(s_1 - |\alpha|^{2n-2} \bar{s}_{n-1} p) \\ & & -\alpha(s_1 - |\alpha|^{2n-2} \bar{s}_{n-1} p) & 1 - |\alpha^n p|^2 \end{array} \right].$$

Since L is positive definite, then the 2×2 principal minor $D_{2,2}$ which is obtained from L is positive, where $D_{2,2} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 - |\alpha^n p|^2 + (|\alpha s_1|^2 - |\alpha^{n-1} s_{n-1}|^2) & -\bar{\alpha}(\bar{s}_1 - |\alpha|^{2n-2} s_{n-1} \bar{p}) \\ -\alpha(s_1 - |\alpha|^{2n-2} \bar{s}_{n-1} p) & 1 - |\alpha^n p|^2 \end{bmatrix}$. The positive definiteness of $D_{2,2}$ is equivalent to $|\alpha(s_1 - |\alpha|^{2n-2} \bar{s}_{n-1} p)|^2 < (n-1)^2 a^2$. Hence, for $i = 1$, the result follows from the positive definiteness of $D_{2,2}$. For $i = 2$, we will take the principal minor $D_{3,3}$ from L . Since L is positive, $D_{3,3}$ is also positive. If we consider the principal minor

$$S(1, 3) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 - |\alpha^n p|^2 + (|\alpha s_1|^2 - |\alpha^{n-1} s_{n-1}|^2) + (|\alpha^2 s_2|^2 - |\alpha^{n-2} s_{n-2}|^2) & -\bar{\alpha}^2 (\bar{s}_2 - |\alpha|^{2n-4} s_{n-2} \bar{p}) \\ -\alpha^2 (s_2 - |\alpha|^{2n-4} \bar{s}_{n-2} p) & 1 - |\alpha^n p|^2 \end{bmatrix}$$

from $D_{3,3}$, then $S(1, 3)$ is positive. Also, the positive definiteness of $S(1, 3)$ is equivalent to

$$|\alpha^2 (s_2 - |\alpha|^{2n-4} \bar{s}_{n-2} p)|^2 < \frac{(n-1)^2 (n-2)^2}{(2!)^2} a^2.$$

Assume that the Inequality-2.19 is true for fixed values of i . Now, we wish to show that it is true with i replaced by $i + 1$. To prove this we need to consider the principal minor $D_{i+2, i+2}$ from L . Now,

$$\begin{aligned}
|\alpha^{i+1}(s_{i+1} - |\alpha|^{2(n-i-1)}\bar{s}_{n-i-1}p)|^2 &< \frac{\overbrace{(n-i)^2(n-i+1)^2(n-i+2)^2 \dots (n-1)^2}^i a^2}{(i!)^2} \\
&+ (|\alpha^{i+1} s_{i+1}|^2 - |\alpha^{n-i-1} s_{n-i-1}|^2) \\
&< \frac{\overbrace{(n-i-1)^2(n-i)^2(n-i+1)^2 \dots (n-1)^2}^{i+1} a^2}{((i+1)!)^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

This completes the induction step.

Now, our next goal is to show that for all $k(i) \geq (|c_i| + |c_{n-i}|)$

$$k(i)^2 a - m(n-i, i) > 2k(i) |\alpha^i (s_i - |\alpha|^{2(n-i)} \bar{s}_{n-i} p)| \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, m$$

and

$$k(i)^2 a - m(i, n-i) > 2k(i) |\alpha^{n-i}(s_{n-i} - |\alpha|^{2i} \bar{s}_i p)| \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, m.$$

The condition $k(i) \geq (|c_i| + |c_{n-i}|)$ is equivalent to $k(i) \geq \frac{(n-i+1)\dots(n-1)n}{i!}$. Using Inequality- 2.18 and Inequality-2.19, we conclude that for all $k(i) \geq (|c_i| + |c_{n-i}|)$

$$k(i)^2 a - \frac{n(n-1)^2 \dots (n-i+1)^2 (n-2i)a}{(i!)^2} > 2k(i) |\alpha^{n-i}(s_{n-i} - |\alpha|^{2i} \bar{s}_i p)| \quad (2.22)$$

for $i = 1, \dots, m$ and

$$k(i)^2 a - \frac{n(n-1)^2 \dots (n-i+1)^2 (2i-n)a}{(i!)^2} > 2k(i) |\alpha^i(s_i - |\alpha|^{2(n-i)} \bar{s}_{n-i} p)| \quad (2.23)$$

for $i = 1, \dots, m$. Again, using Inequality- 2.20 and Inequality-2.21, we have that for all $k(i) \geq (|c_i| + |c_{n-i}|)$

$$k(i)^2 a - m(n-i, i) > 2k(i) |\alpha^i(s_i - |\alpha|^{2(n-i)} \bar{s}_{n-i} p)| \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, m$$

and

$$k(i)^2 a - m(i, n-i) > 2k(i) |\alpha^{n-i}(s_{n-i} - |\alpha|^{2i} \bar{s}_i p)| \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, m.$$

Therefore, for all $\omega \in \mathbb{T}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} k(i)^2 a - m(i, n-i) &> 2k(i) \operatorname{Re} \omega \alpha^{n-i}(s_{n-i} - |\alpha|^{2i} \bar{s}_i p) \\ &= k(i) \omega \alpha^{n-i}(s_{n-i} - |\alpha|^{2i} \bar{s}_i p) + k(i) \bar{\omega} \bar{\alpha}^{n-i}(\bar{s}_{n-i} - |\alpha|^{2i} s_i \bar{p}) \end{aligned} \quad (2.24)$$

for $i = 1, \dots, m$. Choosing $\omega = 1$ and substituting the value of $a, m(i, n-i)$ in Inequality-2.24 we get

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_{2k(i)}^{(i)}(\alpha^i s_i, \alpha^{n-i} s_{n-i}, \alpha^n p) &= k(i)^2 (1 - |\alpha^n p|^2) + (|\alpha^{n-i} s_{n-i}|^2 - |\alpha^i s_i|^2) \\ &\quad - k(i) \alpha^{n-i}(s_{n-i} - |\alpha|^{2i} \bar{s}_i p) - k(i) \bar{\alpha}^{n-i}(\bar{s}_{n-i} - |\alpha|^{2i} s_i \bar{p}) \\ &> 0 \end{aligned}$$

for $i = 1, \dots, m$. For $i = 1, \dots, m$, by continuity, we have $\Phi_{2k(i)}^{(i)}(\alpha^i s_i, \alpha^{n-i} s_{n-i}, \alpha^n p) \geq 0$, for all $\alpha \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}$. Similarly, for $i = 1, \dots, m$, we can prove that $\Phi_{2k(i)}^{(i)}(\alpha^{n-i} s_{n-i}, \alpha^i s_i, \alpha^n p) \geq 0$, for all $\alpha \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}$. The condition (1) and (2) are equivalent, implies that $(s_1, \dots, s_m, s_{m+1}, \dots, s_{n-1}, p) \in \Gamma_n$ if and only if $(s_{n-1}, \dots, s_{m+1}, s_m, \dots, s_1, p) \in \Gamma_n$. Therefore, $\Phi_{1k(i)}^{(i)}(\alpha^i s_i, \alpha^{n-i} s_{n-i}, \alpha^n p) = \Phi_{2k(i)}^{(i)}(\alpha^{n-i} s_{n-i}, \alpha^i s_i, \alpha^n p)$. Hence, for $i = 1, \dots, m$, $\Phi_{1k(i)}^{(i)}(\alpha^i s_i, \alpha^{n-i} s_{n-i}, \alpha^n p) \geq 0$, for all $\alpha \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}$.

Case-2: Let $n = 2m$. For this case, we will prove the following two inequality for

$$|\alpha^{n-i}(s_{n-i} - |\alpha|^{2i} \bar{s}_i p)|^2 < \frac{\overbrace{(n-i+1)^2 (n-i+2)^2 \dots (n-1)^2}^{i-1}}{((i-1)!)^2} a^2 \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, m, \quad (2.25)$$

and

$$|\alpha^i(s_i - |\alpha|^{2(n-i)} \bar{s}_{n-i} p)|^2 < \frac{\overbrace{(n-i)^2 (n-i+1)^2 \dots (n-1)^2}^i}{(i!)^2} a^2 \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, m-1. \quad (2.26)$$

To prove this first we will show that

$$|\alpha^i s_i|^2 - |\alpha^{n-i} s_{n-i}|^2 \leq \begin{cases} \frac{n(n-1)^2 \dots (n-i+1)^2 (n-2i)a}{(i!)^2} & \text{if } n > 2i; \\ 0 & \text{if } n = 2i; \\ \frac{n(n-1)^2 \dots (n-i+1)^2 (2i-n)a}{(i!)^2} & \text{if } n < 2i. \end{cases}$$

The proof is similar to the **Case-1**. We leave the details to the reader. Step by step we will also verify the the Inequality 2.25 and Inequality 2.26.

Step-1: For this step we will prove the Inequality -2.25. The proof is same as the **Step-1** of **Case-1**.

Step-2: For this step we will prove the Inequality -2.26. The proof is also similar to the **Step-2** of **Case-1**.

For this case also, our next goal is to show that for all $k(i) \geq (|c_i| + |c_{n-i}|)$

$$k(i)^2 a - m(n-i, i) > 2k(i) |\alpha^i(s_i - |\alpha|^{2(n-i)} \bar{s}_{n-i} p)| \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, m$$

and

$$k(i)^2 a - m(i, n-i) > 2k(i) |\alpha^{n-i}(s_{n-i} - |\alpha|^{2i} \bar{s}_i p)| \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, m-1.$$

The proof is similar to the **Case-1**. We leave the details to the reader. Similar to **Case-1**, one can also prove that

$$\Phi_{1k(i)}^{(i)}(\alpha^i s_i, \alpha^{n-i} s_{n-i}, \alpha^n p) \geq 0 \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, m-1$$

and

$$\Phi_{2k(i)}^{(i)}(\alpha^i s_i, \alpha^{n-i} s_{n-i}, \alpha^n p) \geq 0 \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, m$$

for all $\alpha \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}$ with $k(i) \geq (|c_i| + |c_{n-i}|)$. We also leave the details to the reader. Thus, (1) implies (4).

Now we will prove that (4) and (5) are equivalent. The proof that (4) is equivalent to (5) is easy.

To prove (4) implies (6). If for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$, $s_i = \bar{s}_{n-i} p$ and $s_{n-i} = \bar{s}_i p$, then the above inequality is obvious. So, we assume that $s_i \neq \bar{s}_{n-i} p$ and $s_{n-i} \neq \bar{s}_i p$ for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$. For all $\alpha_i, \alpha_{n-i} \in \mathbb{T}$, we have

$$\Phi_{1k(i)}^{(i)}(\alpha_i^i s_i, \alpha_i^{n-i} s_{n-i}, \alpha_i^n p) + \Phi_{2k(i)}^{(i)}(\alpha_{n-i}^i s_i, \alpha_{n-i}^{n-i} s_{n-i}, \alpha_{n-i}^n p) \geq 0$$

for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$ with $k(i) \geq (|c_i| + |c_{n-i}|)$. Equivalently, for all $\alpha_i, \alpha_{n-i} \in \mathbb{T}$, we get

$$\operatorname{Re} k(i) [\alpha_i^i (s_i - \bar{s}_{n-i} p) + \alpha_{n-i}^{n-i} (s_{n-i} - \bar{s}_i p)] \leq k(i)^2 (1 - |p|^2),$$

for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$, with $k(i) \geq (|c_i| + |c_{n-i}|)$. Since $s_i \neq \bar{s}_{n-i} p$ and $s_{n-i} \neq \bar{s}_i p$ for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$, if we choose

$$\alpha_i = \sqrt[i]{\frac{\bar{s}_i - s_{n-i} \bar{p}}{|s_i - \bar{s}_{n-i} p|}} \text{ and } \alpha_{n-i} = \sqrt[n-i]{\frac{\bar{s}_{n-i} - s_i \bar{p}}{|s_{n-i} - \bar{s}_i p|}},$$

then we have $|s_i - \bar{s}_{n-i} p| + |s_{n-i} - \bar{s}_i p| \leq ((\binom{n-1}{i} + \binom{n-1}{n-i}))(1 - |p|^2)$, for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$.

Now we will prove (6) implies (7). Suppose (6) holds. Then $|p| \leq 1$. If $|p| = 1$, then $s_i = \bar{s}_{n-i} p$ and $s_{n-i} = \bar{s}_i p$. Therefore, by Theorem 2.1, we conclude that there exist $c_1, \dots, c_{n-1}$ with the condition $|c_i| + |c_{n-i}| \leq (\binom{n-1}{i} + \binom{n-1}{n-i})$ such that $s_i = c_i + \bar{c}_{n-i} p$, $s_{n-i} = c_{n-i} + \bar{c}_i p$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$.

When $|p| < 1$, if we choose

$$c_i = \frac{s_i - \bar{s}_{n-i} p}{1 - |p|^2} \text{ and } c_{n-i} = \frac{s_{n-i} - \bar{s}_i p}{1 - |p|^2},$$

then one can easily verify that $s_i = c_i + \bar{c}_{n-i} p$, $s_{n-i} = c_{n-i} + \bar{c}_i p$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$. Also since (6) holds for $k(i) = (\binom{n-1}{i} + \binom{n-1}{n-i})$, we have $|c_i| + |c_{n-i}| \leq (\binom{n-1}{i} + \binom{n-1}{n-i})$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$.

Thus, combining all the above implication, we concluded that all conditions above are equivalent. $\square$

3. Γ_n -CONTRACTIOS AND THEIR FUNDAMENTAL OPERATORS

A commuting n -tuples bounded operators $(S_1, \dots, S_{n-1}, P)$ for which Γ_n is a spectral set is called a Γ_n contraction. Various properties of Γ_n and Γ_n -contractions were described in [21]. Now, we recall the definition of polynomially convexity from the book of E.L.Stout[70].

Definition 3.1. A compact subset X of C^n is polynomially convex if for each point $z \in C^n - X$ there is a polynomial q such that $|q(z)| > \sup\{|q(x)| : x \in X\} = \|q\|_{\infty, X}$.

Polynomially convexity of Γ_n plays an important role to describe the definition of Γ_n -contraction more precisely. The following lemma was proved for $n = 3$ in [53]. Now we will prove it for any natural number n .

Lemma 3.2. A commuting n -tuples of bounded operators $(S_1, \dots, S_{n-1}, P)$ is a Γ_n contractions if and only if

$$\|q(S_1, \dots, P)\| \leq \|q\|_{\infty, \Gamma_n}, \quad (3.1)$$

for all polynomial p in n -variables.

Proof. Suppose $(S_1, \dots, S_{n-1}, P)$ is a Γ_n contractions. Then Inequality-3.1 follows immediately from the definition of Γ_n contractions.

To prove the converse part we will use the definition of polynomially convexity. Suppose $\sigma_T(S_1, \dots, P)$ is not contained in Γ_n . Then there is a point $(s_1, \dots, p)$ in $\sigma_T(S_1, \dots, P)$ that is not contained in Γ_n . By polynomially convexity of Γ_n , there is a polynomial q such that $|q(s_1, \dots, p)| > \|q\|_{\infty, \Gamma_n}$. Using spectral mapping theorem, we conclude that $\|q(S_1, \dots, P)\| > \|q\|_{\infty, \Gamma_n}$. This would lead to the contradiction to the fact that Γ_n is a spectral set for $(S_1, \dots, P)$. This completes the proof of the lemma. $\square$

As a consequence, we will prove the following corollary.

Corollary 3.3. *If $(S_1, \dots, P)$ is a Γ_n -contractions, then $\|S_i\| \leq \binom{n-1}{i} + \binom{n-1}{n-i}$ and $\|P\| \leq 1$.*

Proof. If we consider the co-ordinate polynomials, then, the result follows automatically by using Lemma 3.1 and Theorem 2.1. $\square$

A polynomial $q \in \mathbb{C}[z_1, \dots, z_n]$ is called symmetric if $q(\sigma.z) := q(z_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, z_{\sigma(n)}) = q(z)$ for all $z \in \mathbb{C}^n$ and $\sigma \in S_n$, where S_n is the symmetric group on n symbols. In [21], it is shown that in general the symmetrization of any three commuting contractions may not be Γ_3 contraction. The following proposition tells the condition for which the symmetrization of an n -tuples of commuting contractions $(T_1, \dots, T_n)$ is a Γ_n contraction.

Proposition 3.4. *(Proposition-2.12, [21]) The symmetrization of an n -tuples of commuting contractions $(T_1, \dots, T_n)$ is a Γ_n contraction if and only if $(T_1, \dots, T_n)$ satisfies the analogue of von Neumann,s inequality for all symmetric polynomials in $\mathbb{C}[z_1, \dots, z_n]$.*

As a consequence, we will get the following corollary.

Corollary 3.5. *If $(S_1, \dots, P)$ is a Γ_n -contractions, then $(S_{n-1}, S_{n-2}, \dots, S_2, S_1, P)$ is also Γ_n -contractions.*

Proof. Let f be a polynomial in n -variables $z_1, \dots, z_n$ and let $g(z_1, \dots, z_n) = f(z_{n-1}, \dots, z_1, z_n)$. Then we have $\|f\|_{\infty, \Gamma_n} = \|g\|_{\infty, \Gamma_n}$, because Γ_n is a symmetric domain. By using Proposition 3.4, we conclude that $(S_{n-1}, S_{n-2}, \dots, S_2, S_1, P)$ is a Γ_n -contractions. $\square$

One can ask, what can be said if we will take the symmetrization of an n -tuples of commuting contractions $(T_1^*, \dots, T_n^*)$. To answer this, we will prove the following proposition.

Proposition 3.6. *The symmetrization of an n -tuples of commuting contractions $\mathbf{T}^* = (T_1^*, \dots, T_n^*)$ is a Γ_n contraction if and only if $\mathbf{T} = (T_1, \dots, T_n)$ satisfies the analogue of von Neumann,s inequality for all symmetric polynomials $\tilde{p}_*$ whose co-efficients are the conjugate of the corresponding co-efficients of all symmetric polynomials $\tilde{p}$ in $\mathbb{C}[z_1, \dots, z_n]$.*

Proof. Let $\mathbf{T} = (T_1, \dots, T_n)$ be the commuting n tuples of contractions satisfying the analogue of von Neumann,s inequality for all symmetric polynomials $\tilde{p}_*$ whose co-efficients are the conjugate of the corresponding co-efficients of all symmetric polynomials $\tilde{p}$ in $\mathbb{C}[z_1, \dots, z_n]$. We show that $s(\mathbf{T}^*) = (s_1(\mathbf{T}^*), \dots, s_n(\mathbf{T}^*))$ is a Γ_n contraction. Again, let q be an arbitrary polynomial in $\mathbb{C}[z_1, \dots, z_n]$. Then $\|q_*\|_{\infty, \Gamma_n} = \|q\|_{\infty, \Gamma_n}$. Now,

$$\begin{aligned} \|q(s_1(\mathbf{T}^*), \dots, s_n(\mathbf{T}^*))\| &= \|(q_*(s_1(\mathbf{T}), \dots, s_n(\mathbf{T}))^*)\| \\ &= \|(q_*(s_1(\mathbf{T}), \dots, s_n(\mathbf{T}))\| \\ &\leq \|q_* \circ s\|_{\infty, \mathbb{D}^n} \\ &= \|q_*\|_{\infty, \Gamma_n} \\ &= \|q\|_{\infty, \Gamma_n} \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we conclude that $s(\mathbf{T}^*) = (s_1(\mathbf{T}^*), \dots, s_n(\mathbf{T}^*))$ is a Γ_n contraction.

Conversely, let $\mathbf{T}^* = (T_1^*, \dots, T_n^*)$ be the commuting n tuples of contractions such that $s(\mathbf{T}^*)$ is a Γ_n contraction and $\tilde{q}_*$ be the arbitrary symmetric polynomial, whose co-efficients are the conjugate of the corresponding

co-efficients of the symmetric polynomials $\tilde{q}$ in $\mathbb{C}[z_1, \dots, z_n]$. Since $\tilde{q}$ is a symmetric polynomial, there is a $\tilde{p}$ such that $\tilde{p} \circ s = \tilde{q}$. Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{q}_*(\mathbf{T})\| &= \|(\tilde{q}(T_1^*, \dots, T_n^*))^*\| \\ &= \|\tilde{q}(T_1^*, \dots, T_n^*)\| \\ &= \|\tilde{p}(s(T_1^*, \dots, T_n^*))\| \\ &\leq \|\tilde{p}\|_{\infty, \Gamma_n} \\ &= \|\tilde{p} \circ s\|_{\infty, \mathbb{D}^n} \\ &= \|\tilde{q}\|_{\infty, \Gamma_n} = \|\tilde{q}_*\|_{\infty, \Gamma_n}. \end{aligned}$$

□

As a consequence, we will state the following corollary.

Corollary 3.7. *If $(S_1, \dots, P)$ is a Γ_n -contractions, then $(S_1^*, \dots, P^*)$ is also a Γ_n -contractions.*

Proposition 3.8. *For $n \geq 3$, let $(S_1, \dots, P)$ be a Γ_n -contractions. Then*

$$\Phi_{1k(i)}^{(i)}(\alpha^i S_i, \alpha^{n-i} S_{n-i}, \alpha^n P) \geq 0$$

and

$$\Phi_{2k(i)}^{(i)}(\alpha^i S_i, \alpha^{n-i} S_{n-i}, \alpha^n p) \geq 0$$

for all $\alpha \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}$ with $k(i) \geq \binom{n-1}{i} + \binom{n-1}{n-i}$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$.

Proof. Since $(S_1, \dots, P)$ is a Γ_n -contractions, $\sigma_T(S_1, \dots, P) \subseteq \Gamma_n$. Let f be a holomorphic function in a neighbourhood of Γ_n . Since Γ_n is a polynomially convex, by Oka-Weil theorem([35]), there exists a sequence of polynomials $\{p_n\}$ that converges uniformly to f on Γ_n . So by Theorem-9.9 of Chapter-III of [73] we get

$$p_n(S_1, \dots, P) \rightarrow f(S_1, \dots, P)$$

which by virtue of $(S_1, \dots, P)$ being a Γ_n -contraction implies that

$$\|f(S_1, \dots, P)\| = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|p_n(S_1, \dots, P)\| \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|p_n\|_{\infty, \Gamma_n} = \|f\|.$$

For fix $\alpha \in \mathbb{D}$ and choose

$$f_i(s_1, \dots, p) = \frac{k(i)\alpha^n p - \alpha^{n-i} s_{n-i}}{k(i) - \alpha^i s_i}$$

for all $i = 1, \dots, n-1$. Since $k(i) \geq \binom{n-1}{i} + \binom{n-1}{n-i}$, f is well defined holomorphic function in a neighbourhood of Γ_n . Also from part-5 of Theorem 2.3, f has norm not greater than one. Therefore, we have

$$\|(k(i)\alpha^n P - \alpha^{n-i} S_{n-i})(k(i) - \alpha^i S_i)^{-1}\| \leq \|f\|_{\infty, \Gamma_n} \leq 1$$

which is equivalent to

$$I - (k(i) - \alpha^i S_i)^{* -1} (k(i)\alpha^n P - \alpha^{n-i} S_{n-i})^* (k(i)\alpha^n P - \alpha^{n-i} S_{n-i})(k(i) - \alpha^i S_i)^{-1} \geq 0.$$

Equivalently,

$$(k(i) - \alpha^i S_i)^* (k(i) - \alpha^i S_i) \geq (k(i)\alpha^n P - \alpha^{n-i} S_{n-i})^* (k(i)\alpha^n P - \alpha^{n-i} S_{n-i}).$$

So by definition of $\Phi_{1k(i)}^{(i)}$, we get that $\Phi_{1k(i)}^{(i)}(\alpha^i S_i, \alpha^{n-i} S_{n-i}, \alpha^n P) \geq 0$ for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{D}$. By continuity we have that $\Phi_{1k(i)}^{(i)}(\alpha^i S_i, \alpha^{n-i} S_{n-i}, \alpha^n P) \geq 0$ for all $\alpha \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}$. Similarly, one can also prove that

$$\Phi_{2k(i)}^{(i)}(\alpha^i S_i, \alpha^{n-i} S_{n-i}, \alpha^n p) \geq 0$$

for all $\alpha \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}$. This completes the proof. □

Let $(S_1, \dots, P)$ be the commuting n -tuples of bounded operators defined on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ with $\|P\| \leq 1$. Given a contraction P , denote D_P and $\mathcal{D}_P$ by the defect operator $(I - P^*P)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ and its range closure respectively. The fundamental equations for the commuting n -tuples of bounded operators $(S_1, \dots, P)$ are defined in the following way:

$$S_i - S_{n-i}^*P = D_P E_i D_P \text{ and } S_{n-i} - S_i^*P = D_P E_{n-i} D_P, E_i, E_{n-i} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{D}_P),$$

for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$. We recall the definition of numerical radius of a bounded operator A on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$.

Definition 3.9. The numerical radius of a bounded operator A on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ is defined by

$$\omega(A) = \sup\{|\langle Ax, x \rangle| : \|x\| = 1\}.$$

It is also well known that

$$r(A) \leq \omega(A) \leq \|A\| \text{ and } \frac{1}{2}\|A\| \leq \omega(A) \leq \|A\|,$$

where $r(A)$ is the spectral radius of A . Also if the numerical radius of a bounded operator A is not greater than n then $\operatorname{Re} \alpha A \leq nI$ for all complex number α with $|\alpha| = 1$ and vice-versa. In [53], it is shown that if two bounded operators A_1, A_2 with $\omega(A_1 + zA_2) \leq n$ for all $z \in \mathbb{T}$, then $\omega(A_1 + zA_2^*) \leq n$ and $\omega(A_1^* + zA_2) \leq n$ for all $z \in \mathbb{T}$.

Lemma 3.10. Let $A_1, \dots, A_{n-1}$ be $n-1$ bounded operators on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$. Then the following are equivalent:

- (1) $[A_i, A_j] = 0$ and $[A_i, A_{n-j}^*] = [A_j, A_{n-i}^*]$ for $1 \leq i, j \leq n-1$, where $[P, Q] = PQ - QP$ for two operators P, Q ;
- (2) $A_i^* + A_{n-i}z$ and $A_j^* + A_{n-j}z$ commute for every z with $|z| = 1$ and for $1 \leq i, j \leq n-1$;
- (3) $A_i^* + A_{n-i}z$ is a normal operator for every z with $|z| = 1$ and for $1 \leq i \leq n-1$;
- (4) $A_{n-i}^* + A_i z$ is a normal operator for every z with $|z| = 1$ and for $1 \leq i \leq n-1$.

Proof. First we will prove (1) implies (2). Now, $A_i^* + A_{n-i}z$ and $A_j^* + A_{n-j}z$ commute if and only if for every $z \in \mathbb{T}$

$$[A_i^*, A_j^*] + ([A_{n-i}, A_j^*] - [A_{n-j}, A_i^*])z + [A_{n-i}, A_{n-j}]z^2 = 0. \quad (3.2)$$

Thus, (1) implies (2).

Now, we will prove (2) implies (1). Putting $z = \pm 1$ and $z = \pm i$ in Equation-3.2, we have $[A_i, A_j] = 0$ and $[A_i^*, A_j^*] = 0$, for $1 \leq i, j \leq n-1$. Again, putting the conditions $[A_i, A_j] = 0$ and $[A_i^*, A_j^*] = 0$ in Equation-3.2, we get $[A_i, A_{n-j}^*] = [A_j, A_{n-i}^*]$ for $1 \leq i, j \leq n-1$.

The proof of (1) is equivalent (3) and (1) is equivalent (4) are very easy. We leave the details for the reader. $\square$

The following theorem tells that if $(S_1, \dots, P)$ is a Γ_n contraction then the fundamental equations has unique solutions.

Theorem 3.11. (Existence and Uniqueness) For $n \geq 3$, let $(S_1, \dots, P)$ be a Γ_n -contraction on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$. Then there are unique operators $E_1, \dots, E_{n-1} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{D}_P)$ such that $S_i - S_{n-i}^*P = D_P E_i D_P$ and $S_{n-i} - S_i^*P = D_P E_{n-i} D_P, E_i, E_{n-i} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{D}_P)$, for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$. Moreover, for all $z \in \mathbb{T}$, $\omega(E_i + E_{n-i}z) \leq \binom{n-1}{i} + \binom{n-1}{n-i}$.

Proof. Applying Proposition 3.8 we have

$$\Phi_{1k(i)}^{(i)}(\alpha^i S_i, \alpha^{n-i} S_{n-i}, \alpha^n P) \geq 0 \quad (3.3)$$

and

$$\Phi_{2k(i)}^{(i)}(\alpha^i S_i, \alpha^{n-i} S_{n-i}, \alpha^n P) \geq 0 \quad (3.4)$$

for all $\alpha \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}$ with $k(i) \geq \binom{n-1}{i} + \binom{n-1}{n-i}$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$. In particular, for all $\beta \in \mathbb{T}$, we get from Equation 3.3, 3.4 respectively,

$$k(i)^2(I - P^*P) + (S_i^* S_i - S_{n-i}^* S_{n-i}) - k(i)\beta^i(S_i - S_{n-i}^*P) - k(i)\bar{\beta}^i(S_i^* - P^* S_{n-i}) \geq 0 \quad (3.5)$$

and

$$k(i)^2(I - P^*P) + (S_{n-i}^*S_{n-i} - S_i^*S_i) - k(i)\beta^{n-i}(S_{n-i} - S_i^*P) - k(i)\bar{\beta}^{n-i}(S_{n-i}^* - P^*S_i) \geq 0 \quad (3.6)$$

for all $i = 1, \dots, n-1$. By adding Equation 3.5 and 3.6, we have

$$2k(i)(I - P^*P) \geq \beta^i(S_i - S_{n-i}^*P) + \bar{\beta}^i(S_i^* - P^*S_{n-i}) + \beta^{n-i}(S_{n-i} - S_i^*P) + \bar{\beta}^{n-i}(S_{n-i}^* - P^*S_i) \quad (3.7)$$

for all $i = 1, \dots, n-1$. Let

$$\begin{aligned} \eta^{(i)}(\beta) &= 2k(i)(I - P^*P) - \beta^i(S_i - S_{n-i}^*P) - \bar{\beta}^i(S_i^* - P^*S_{n-i}) \\ &\quad - \beta^{n-i}(S_{n-i} - S_i^*P) - \bar{\beta}^{n-i}(S_{n-i}^* - P^*S_i) \end{aligned} \quad (3.8)$$

for all $i = 1, \dots, n-1$. From Equation 3.7, we have $\eta^{(i)}(\beta) \geq 0$, for all $\beta \in \mathbb{T}$ and $i = 1, \dots, n-1$. Therefore, by operator Fejer-Reisz Theorem (Theorem-1.2, [30]), there is a polynomial of degree 2 say $P^{(i)}(\beta) = X_0^{(i)} + X_1^{(i)}\beta + X_2^{(i)}\beta^2$ such that for all $\beta \in \mathbb{T}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \eta^{(i)}(\beta) &= P(\beta)^*P(\beta) \\ &= (X_0^{(i)} + X_1^{(i)}\beta + X_2^{(i)}\beta^2)^*(X_0^{(i)} + X_1^{(i)}\beta + X_2^{(i)}\beta^2) \\ &= (X_0^{(i)*}X_0^{(i)} + X_1^{(i)*}X_1^{(i)} + X_2^{(i)*}X_2^{(i)}) + (X_0^{(i)*}X_1^{(i)} + X_1^{(i)*}X_2^{(i)})\beta \\ &\quad + (X_0^{(i)*}X_1^{(i)} + X_1^{(i)*}X_2^{(i)})^*\bar{\beta} + X_0^{(i)*}X_2^{(i)}\beta^2 + X_2^{(i)*}X_0^{(i)}\bar{\beta}^2 \end{aligned} \quad (3.9)$$

for all $i = 1, \dots, n-1$. Comparing Equation 3.8 and Equation 3.9, we have

$$2k(i)D_P^2 = X_0^{(i)*}X_0^{(i)} + X_1^{(i)*}X_1^{(i)} + X_2^{(i)*}X_2^{(i)} \quad (3.10)$$

$$S_i - S_{n-i}^*P = -X_0^{(i)*}X_1^{(i)} + X_1^{(i)*}X_2^{(i)} \quad (3.11)$$

$$S_{n-i} - S_i^*P = -X_0^{(i)*}X_2^{(i)} \quad (3.12)$$

for all $i = 1, \dots, n-1$. From Equation 3.10, we get

$$2k(i)D_P^2 \geq X_0^{(i)*}X_0^{(i)}, 2k(i)D_P^2 \geq X_1^{(i)*}X_1^{(i)} \text{ and } 2k(i)D_P^2 \geq X_2^{(i)*}X_2^{(i)}$$

for all $i = 1, \dots, n-1$. Therefore, by Douglas's lemma (Lemma-2.1, [29]), there are contractions $Z_0^{(i)}, Z_1^{(i)}, Z_2^{(i)}$ such that

$$X_0^{(i)*} = \sqrt{2k(i)}D_PZ_0^{(i)}, X_1^{(i)*} = \sqrt{2k(i)}D_PZ_1^{(i)} \text{ and } X_2^{(i)*} = \sqrt{2k(i)}D_PZ_2^{(i)}$$

for all $i = 1, \dots, n-1$. Putting these values in Equation 3.11 and Equation 3.12, we have

$$S_i - S_{n-i}^*P = D_P[-2k(i)(Z_0^{(i)}Z_1^{(i)*} + Z_1^{(i)}Z_2^{(i)*})]D_P$$

and

$$S_{n-i} - S_i^*P = D_P(-2k(i)Z_0^{(i)}Z_2^{(i)*})D_P$$

for all $i = 1, \dots, n-1$. For all $i = 1, \dots, n-1$, let

$$E_i = P_{\mathcal{D}_P}[-2k(i)(Z_0^{(i)}Z_1^{(i)*} + Z_1^{(i)}Z_2^{(i)*})] \mid_{\mathcal{D}_P}, E_{n-i} = P_{\mathcal{D}_P}(-2k(i)(Z_0^{(i)}Z_2^{(i)*}) \mid_{\mathcal{D}_P}.$$

Then E_i, E_{n-i} are the solutions to the equations $S_i - S_{n-i}^*P = D_PX_iD_P$ and $S_{n-i} - S_i^*P = D_PX_{n-i}D_P$ respectively, for all $i = 1, \dots, n-1$.

Uniqueness: Let E_i, G_i be two solutions of the equation $S_i - S_{n-i}^*P = D_PX_iD_P$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n-1$. Then $D_P(E_i - G_i)D_P = 0$, which implies that $E_i = G_i$ on $\mathcal{D}_P$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n-1$.

Also, from Equation 3.7 we have that

$$\begin{aligned} 2k(i)D_P^2 &\geq 2\operatorname{Re} \beta^i \{(S_i - S_{n-i}^*P) + \beta^{n-2i}(S_{n-i} - S_i^*P)\} \\ &= 2\operatorname{Re} \beta^i [D_P E_i D_P + \beta^{n-2i} D_P E_{n-i} D_P] \end{aligned} \quad (3.13)$$

for all $i = 1, \dots, n-1$. Therefore, we get $D_P^2 \geq \operatorname{Re} \beta^i D_P F_i(\beta) D_P$, where $F_i(\beta) = \frac{1}{k(i)}(E_i + \beta^{n-2i} E_{n-i})$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n-1$. This implies that $I_{\mathcal{D}_P} - \operatorname{Re} \beta^i F_i(\beta) \geq 0$, because $F_i(\beta)$ is defined on $\mathcal{D}_P$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n-1$. Hence, we have $\operatorname{Re} \beta^i F_i(\beta) \leq I_{\mathcal{D}_P}$ for all $\beta \in \mathbb{T}$ and $i = 1, \dots, n-1$. Therefore, we conclude that $\omega(F_i(\beta)) \leq 1$.

This shows that $\omega(E_i + \beta^{n-2i}E_{n-i}) \leq k(i)$ for all $\beta \in \mathbb{T}$ and $i = 1, \dots, n-1$ with $k(i) \geq \binom{n-1}{i} + \binom{n-1}{n-i}$. Hence, $\omega(E_i + \beta^{n-2i}E_{n-i}) \leq \binom{n-1}{i} + \binom{n-1}{n-i}$ for all $\beta \in \mathbb{T}$ and $i = 1, \dots, n-1$. This completes the proof. $\square$

Remark 3.12. From Theorem 3.11, it is clear that $S_i - S_{n-i}^*P$ is equal to zero on the orthogonal complement of $\mathcal{D}_P$ in $\mathcal{H}$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n-1$. Also for the case of Γ_n isometry or Γ_n unitary of $(S_1, \dots, P)$, the $n-1$ tuples of fundamental operators E_i are zero, because for this case $\mathcal{D}_P = \{0\}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$.

In [53], it is shown that if two Γ_3 -contractions are unitarily equivalent then their fundamental operators are also unitarily equivalent. The following proposition tells that the result also holds for the case of arbitrary n .

Proposition 3.13. *If two Γ_n -contractions are unitarily equivalent then their fundamental operators are also unitarily equivalent.*

Proof. The proof is very easy. we leave the details to the reader. $\square$

In [53], it is shown that the converse of the above statement need not hold always.

4. Γ_n -UNITARIES AND Γ_n -ISOMETRIES

We recall that a Γ_n -unitary is a commuting n -tuples of operators $(S_1, \dots, P)$ whose Taylor joint spectrum lies in the distinguished boundary of Γ_n and a Γ_n -isometry is the restriction of a Γ_n -unitary to a joint invariant subspace of $S_1, \dots, S_{n-1}$ and P . In [53], several properties of Γ_3 -unitaries and Γ_n -isometries have been described. In this section we shall want to extend this properties for the case of arbitrary n . We will need a known fact from [19], which says that if T is a bounded operator on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ with $\operatorname{Re} \beta T \leq 0$ for all complex numbers β of modulus 1, then $T = 0$.

Theorem 4.1. *Let $(S_1, \dots, P)$ be a commuting n -tuples of operator defined on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$. Then the following are equivalent:*

- (1) $(S_1, \dots, P)$ is a Γ_n -unitary;
- (2) There exists commuting unitary operators $U_1, \dots, U_n$ on $\mathcal{H}$ such that for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$, $S_i = \sum_{1 \leq k_1 < \dots < k_i \leq n-1} U_{k_1} \dots U_{k_i}$ and $P = \prod_{i=1}^n U_i$;
- (3) P is unitary, $\|S_{n-i}\| \leq \binom{n-1}{i} + \binom{n-1}{n-i}$ and $S_i = S_{n-i}^*P$ for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$;
- (4) P is unitary, $S_i^* = P^*S_{n-i}$, $S_{n-i}^* = P^*S_i$ and $r(S_i) \leq \binom{n-1}{i} + \binom{n-1}{n-i}$, where $r(S_i)$ is the spectral radius of S_i for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$;
- (5) $(S_1, \dots, P)$ is a Γ_n -contraction and P is a unitary ;
- (6) P is unitary and there exist normal operators $C_1, \dots, C_{n-1}$ on $\mathcal{H}$ with $\|C_i\| + \|C_{n-i}\| \leq \binom{n-1}{i} + \binom{n-1}{n-i}$ such that $C_1, \dots, C_{n-1}, P$ commute and $S_i = C_i + C_{n-i}^*P$, $S_{n-i} = C_{n-i} + C_i^*P$ for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$.

Proof. First we will prove (1) implies (2). Let $(S_1, \dots, P)$ be a Γ_n -unitary. Then by spectral theorem for commuting normal operators there exists a spectral measure say $Q(\cdot)$ on $\sigma_T = \sigma_T(S_1, \dots, P)$ such that

$$S_i = \int_{\sigma_T} p_i Q(dz) \text{ and } P = \int_{\sigma_T} p_n Q(dz)$$

for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$. where $p_1, \dots, p_n$ are the co-ordinate functions on $\mathbb{C}_n$. Now choose a measurable right inverse β of the restriction of the function π_n to $\mathbb{T}_n$ so that β maps the distinguished boundary $b\Gamma_n$ of Γ_n to $\mathbb{T}_n$. Let $\beta = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n)$ and $U_j = \int_{\sigma_T} \beta_j Q(dz)$, $j = 1, \dots, n$. Then it is easy to see that $U_1, \dots, U_n$ are commuting unitary operators on $\mathcal{H}$ and

$$\sum_{j=1}^n U_j = \int_{\sigma_T} \sum_{j=1}^n \beta_j Q(dz) = \int_{\sigma_T} p_1 Q(dz) = S_1.$$

Similarly, one can also show that $S_i = \sum_{2 \leq k_1 < \dots < k_i \leq n-1} U_{k_1} \dots U_{k_i}$ and $P = \prod_{i=1}^n U_i$ for $i = 2, \dots, n-1$.

Clearly, (2) implies (3). We will prove now (3) implies (4). Since $S_i = S_{n-i}^*P$ for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$, we have $S_i^* = P^*S_{n-i}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$. Also since P is a unitary, $\|S_i\| = \|S_{n-i}^*P\| \leq \|S_{n-i}\| \leq \binom{n-1}{i} + \binom{n-1}{n-i}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$. Now we need to show $S_{n-i}^* = P^*S_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$. By using Fuglede's theorem [63], we get $P^*S_i = P^*S_{n-i}^*P = S_{n-i}^*$.

We will prove (4) implies (1). Since P is a normal operator and commute with S_i for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$, again by using Fudlege,s theorem, it commutes with S_i^* for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$. Therefore, we have

$$S_i^* S_i = S_i^* P P^* S_i = S_{n-i} P^* S_i = S_{n-i} S_i P^* = S_i S_{n-i} P^* = S_i P^* S_{n-i} = S_i S_i^*$$

for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$. From above we conclude that $S_1, \dots, P$ are commuting normal operators and hence $r(S_i) = \|S_i\|$ for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$.

Let $C^*(S_1, \dots, P)$ be the commutative C^* algebra generated by $S_1, \dots, P$. Using general theory of joint spectrum (Proposition 1.2,[28]), we have

$$\sigma_T(S_1, \dots, P) = \{\varphi(S_1), \dots, \varphi(P) : \varphi \in \mathcal{M}\},$$

where $\mathcal{M}$ is the maximal ideal space of $C^*(S_1, \dots, P)$. Let $(s_1, \dots, p) = (\psi(S_1), \dots, \psi(P)) \in \sigma_T(S_1, \dots, P)$ for some $\psi \in \mathcal{M}$. Then

$$|p|^2 = \bar{p}p = \psi(P)^* \psi(P) = \psi(P^*) \psi(P) = \psi(P^* P) = \psi(I) = 1.$$

Similarly, one can also show that $\bar{s}_i p = s_{n-i}$, $\bar{s}_{n-i} p = s_i$ and $|s_i| \leq \binom{n-1}{i} + \binom{n-1}{n-i}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$. Therefore, by Theorem 2.3, we conclude that $(s_1, \dots, p) \in b\Gamma_n$, that is, $\sigma_T(S_1, \dots, P) \in b\Gamma_n$. Hence $(S_1, \dots, P)$ is a Γ_n -unitary. Thus, (4) implies (1). Combining all we conclude that (1), (2), (3) and (4) are equivalent.

It is also easy to verify (1) implies (5).

We will now show that (5) implies (3). To show (5) implies (3), let $(S_1, \dots, P)$ be a Γ_n contraction and P be a unitary. Since $(S_1, \dots, P)$ is a Γ_n contraction, by Proposition 3.8, we have

$$\Phi_{1k(i)}^{(i)}(\beta^i S_i, \beta^{n-i} S_{n-i}, \beta^n P) \geq 0$$

and

$$\Phi_{2k(i)}^{(i)}(\beta^i S_i, \beta^{n-i} S_{n-i}, \beta^n p) \geq 0$$

for all $\beta \in \mathbb{T}$ with $k(i) \geq \binom{n-1}{i} + \binom{n-1}{n-i}$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$. The condition

$$\Phi_{1k(i)}^{(i)}(\beta^i S_i, \beta^{n-i} S_{n-i}, \beta^n P) \geq 0$$

and

$$\Phi_{2k(i)}^{(i)}(\beta^i S_i, \beta^{n-i} S_{n-i}, \beta^n p) \geq 0$$

is equivalent to

$$k(i)^2(I - P^* P) + (S_i^* S_i - S_{n-i}^* S_{n-i}) - k(i)\beta^i(S_i - S_{n-i}^* P) - k(i)\bar{\beta}^i(S_i^* - P^* S_{n-i}) \geq 0 \quad (4.1)$$

and

$$k(i)^2(I - P^* P) + (S_{n-i}^* S_{n-i} - S_i^* S_i) - k(i)\beta^{n-i}(S_{n-i} - S_i^* P) - k(i)\bar{\beta}^{n-i}(S_{n-i}^* - P^* S_i) \geq 0 \quad (4.2)$$

for all $\beta \in \mathbb{T}$ with $k(i) \geq \binom{n-1}{i} + \binom{n-1}{n-i}$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$. Since P is unitary, we have

$$(S_i^* S_i - S_{n-i}^* S_{n-i}) - k(i)\beta^i(S_i - S_{n-i}^* P) - k(i)\bar{\beta}^i(S_i^* - P^* S_{n-i}) \geq 0 \quad (4.3)$$

and

$$(S_{n-i}^* S_{n-i} - S_i^* S_i) - k(i)\beta^{n-i}(S_{n-i} - S_i^* P) - k(i)\bar{\beta}^{n-i}(S_{n-i}^* - P^* S_i) \geq 0 \quad (4.4)$$

for all $\beta \in \mathbb{T}$ with $k(i) \geq \binom{n-1}{i} + \binom{n-1}{n-i}$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$. Putting $\beta^i = 1$ and $\beta^i = -1$ respectively in Equation 4.3 and adding them, we have

$$S_i^* S_i - S_{n-i}^* S_{n-i} \geq 0 \quad (4.5)$$

for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$. Again, putting $\beta^{n-i} = 1$ and $\beta^{n-i} = -1$ respectively in Equation 4.4 and adding them, we have

$$S_i^* S_i - S_{n-i}^* S_{n-i} \leq 0 \quad (4.6)$$

for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$. Combining Equation 4.5 and Equation 4.6 we have $S_i^* S_i = S_{n-i}^* S_{n-i}$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$. Equation 4.3 is equivalent to $\operatorname{Re} \beta^i(S_i - S_{n-i}^* P) \leq 0$ for all $\beta \in \mathbb{T}$ and for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$. Hence, we get $S_i = S_{n-i}^* P$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$. Again since $(S_1, \dots, P)$ is a Γ_n -contraction, we have $\|S_i\| \leq \binom{n-1}{i} + \binom{n-1}{n-i}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$.

We will prove (2) implies (6). Suppose (2) holds. Then for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$

$$\begin{aligned} S_i &= \sum_{1 \leq k_1 < \dots < k_i \leq n-1} U_{k_1} \dots U_{k_i} \\ &= C_i + C_{n-i}^* P, \end{aligned}$$

where $C_i = \sum_{1 \leq l_1 < \dots < l_i \leq n-1} U_{l_1} \dots U_{l_i}$ and $C_{n-i} = \sum_{1 \leq r_1 < \dots < r_{n-i} \leq n-1} U_{r_1} \dots U_{r_{n-i}}$. Clearly, C_i and C_{n-i} are normal operators and

$$\|C_i\| + \|C_{n-i}\| \leq \binom{n-1}{i} + \binom{n-1}{n-i}$$

for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$.

The proof of (6) implies (3) is very easy. Combining all we conclude that all the above conditions are equivalent. $\square$

We will need a known fact from [13].

Proposition 4.2. (Lemma-2.5,[13]) *Let U, V be a unitary and a pure isometry on Hilbert spaces $\mathcal{H}_1, \mathcal{H}_2$ respectively, and let $X : \mathcal{H}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_2$ be such that $XU = VX$. Then $X = 0$.*

Theorem 4.3. *Let $S_1, \dots, P$ be commuting operators on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$. Then the following are equivalent:*

- (1) $(S_1, \dots, P)$ is a Γ_n -isometry ;
- (2) P is a isometry, $S_i = S_{n-i}^* P$ and $\|S_{n-i}\| \leq \binom{n-1}{i} + \binom{n-1}{n-i}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$;
- (3) P is a isometry, $S_i^* = P^* S_{n-i}$, $S_{n-i}^* = P^* S_i$ and $r(S_i) \leq \binom{n-1}{i} + \binom{n-1}{n-i}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$;
- (4) (Wold-Decomposition): there is an orthogonal decomposition $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_1 \oplus \mathcal{H}_2$ into common invariant subspaces of $S_1, \dots, S_{n-1}$ and P such that $(S_1 | \mathcal{H}_1, \dots, P | \mathcal{H}_1)$ is a Γ_n -unitary and is $(S_1 | \mathcal{H}_2, \dots, P | \mathcal{H}_2)$ a pure Γ_n -isometry ;
- (5) $(S_1, \dots, P)$ is a Γ_n -contraction and P is a isometry;
- (6) $r(S_i) \leq \binom{n-1}{i} + \binom{n-1}{n-i}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$ and

$$\Phi_{1k(i)}^{(i)}(\beta^i S_i, \beta^{n-i} S_{n-i}, \beta^n P) = 0$$

and

$$\Phi_{2k(i)}^{(i)}(\beta^i S_i, \beta^{n-i} S_{n-i}, \beta^n p) = 0$$

for all $\beta \in \mathbb{T}$ with $k(i) \geq \binom{n-1}{i} + \binom{n-1}{n-i}$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$;

Moreover, if the spectral radius of $r(S_i) \leq \binom{n-1}{i} + \binom{n-1}{n-i}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$, then all of the above are equivalent to :

- (7) $r(S_i) \leq \binom{n-1}{i} + \binom{n-1}{n-i}$ for $k(i) \geq \binom{n-1}{i} + \binom{n-1}{n-i}$, $(k(i)\beta^i P - S_{n-i})(k(i) - \beta^i S_i)^{-1}$ and $(k(i)\beta^{n-i} P - S_i)(k(i) - \beta^{n-i} S_{n-i})^{-1}$ are isometry for all $\beta \in \mathbb{T}$ and for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$.

Proof. First we will prove (1) implies (2). By definition, there exists $(\tilde{S}_1, \dots, \tilde{P})$, a Γ_n -unitary on $\mathcal{K}$ such that $\mathcal{H}$ is an invariant subspace of $\tilde{S}_i$'s and $\tilde{P}$ and $S_i = \tilde{S}_i | \mathcal{H}$ and $P = \tilde{P} | \mathcal{H}$. By Theorem-4.1, we have

$$\tilde{S}_i = \tilde{P}^* \tilde{S}_{n-i}, \tilde{P}^* \tilde{P} = I \text{ and } \|\tilde{S}_{n-i}\| \leq \binom{n-1}{i} + \binom{n-1}{n-i}$$

for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$. Compressing to the common invariant subspace of $\mathcal{H}$, we obtain $S_i = S_{n-i}^* P$ and $\|S_{n-i}\| \leq \binom{n-1}{i} + \binom{n-1}{n-i}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$. Thus, (1) implies (2).

Now we will prove (2) implies (3). If we can show that $S_{n-i}^* = P^* S_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$, then we are done. Now, $P^* S_i = P^* S_{n-i}^* P = S_{n-i}^* P^* P = S_{n-i}^*$, as S_{n-i} and P commute for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$.

Suppose (3) holds. Then P is an isometry. Therefore, by Wold-decomposition theorem there is an orthogonal decomposition $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_1 \oplus \mathcal{H}_2$ into reducing subspaces of P such that $P | \mathcal{H}_1$ is a unitary and $P | \mathcal{H}_2$ is a pure isometry, that is,

$$P = \begin{pmatrix} U & 0 \\ 0 & V \end{pmatrix} \text{ on } \mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_1 \oplus \mathcal{H}_2, \text{ where } P | \mathcal{H}_1 = U \text{ and } P | \mathcal{H}_2 = V.$$

Let $S_i = \begin{pmatrix} S_{11}^{(i)} & S_{12}^{(i)} \\ S_{21}^{(i)} & S_{22}^{(i)} \end{pmatrix}$ with respect to the decomposition, where $S_{jk}^{(i)}$ is a bounded operator from $\mathcal{H}_k$ to $\mathcal{H}_j$. Since $PS_i = S_iP$, we have

$$\begin{pmatrix} US_{11}^{(i)} & US_{12}^{(i)} \\ VS_{21}^{(i)} & VS_{22}^{(i)} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} S_{11}^{(i)}U & S_{12}^{(i)}V \\ S_{21}^{(i)}U & S_{22}^{(i)}V \end{pmatrix}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n-1.$$

Thus, $S_{21}^{(i)}U = VS_{21}^{(i)}$ and hence by Proposition-4.2, we obtain $S_{21}^{(i)} = 0$ $i = 1, \dots, n-1$. Again, $P^*S_i = S_{n-i}^*$ gives

$$\begin{pmatrix} U^*S_{11}^{(i)} & U^*S_{12}^{(i)} \\ 0 & V^*S_{22}^{(i)} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} S_{11}^{(n-i)*} & 0 \\ S_{12}^{(n-i)*} & S_{22}^{(n-i)*} \end{pmatrix}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n-1. \quad (4.7)$$

From Equation 4.7, it follows that $S_{12}^{(i)} = 0$ and $U^*S_{11}^{(i)} = S_{11}^{(n-i)*}$, $V^*S_{22}^{(i)} = S_{22}^{(n-i)*}$, $i = 1, \dots, n-1$. Hence, $\mathcal{H}_1, \mathcal{H}_2$ are common reducing subspace for $S_1, \dots, P$ and $(S_{11}^{(i)}, S_{11}^{(n-i)*}, U)$ is a Γ_n -unitary and $(S_{22}^{(i)}, S_{22}^{(n-i)*}, U)$ is a Γ_n -isometry. This is same as saying $(S_1 | \mathcal{H}_1, \dots, P | \mathcal{H}_1)$ is a Γ_n -unitary and is $(S_1 | \mathcal{H}_2, \dots, P | \mathcal{H}_2)$ a pure Γ_n -isometry. Thus, (3) implies (4).

Suppose (4) holds. Then $(S_1 | \mathcal{H}_2, \dots, P | \mathcal{H}_2)$ a Γ_n -isometry. Therefore, by definition of Γ_n -isometry, there is a Hilbert space $\mathcal{K}_2 \supseteq \mathcal{H}_2$ and a Γ_n -unitary $(T_1, \dots, U)$ on $\mathcal{K}_2$ such that $\mathcal{H}_2$ is a common invariant subspace of $T_1, \dots, U$ and that $T_i | \mathcal{H}_2 = S_i | \mathcal{H}_2$ for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$ and $U | \mathcal{H}_2 = P | \mathcal{H}_2$. Set $\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{H}_1 \oplus \mathcal{K}_2$ and $(\tilde{T}_1, \dots, \tilde{U}) = (S_1 | \mathcal{H}_1 \oplus T_1, \dots, P | \mathcal{H}_1 \oplus U)$. Clearly, $(\tilde{T}_1, \dots, \tilde{U})$ is a Γ_n -unitary and it is a Γ_n -unitary extension of $(S_1, \dots, P)$. Therefore, $(S_1, \dots, P)$ is a Γ_n -isometry. Thus, (4) implies (1). Combining all we conclude that (1), (2), (3) and (4) are equivalent.

The proof of (1) implies (5) is easy. We leave the details to the reader.

Suppose (5) holds. Then, by Proposition 3.8, we have

$$\Phi_{1k(i)}^{(i)}(\beta^i S_i, \beta^{n-i} S_{n-i}, \beta^n P) \geq 0$$

and

$$\Phi_{2k(i)}^{(i)}(\beta^i S_i, \beta^{n-i} S_{n-i}, \beta^n P) \geq 0$$

for all $\beta \in \mathbb{T}$ with $k(i) \geq \binom{n-1}{i} + \binom{n-1}{n-i}$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$.

The condition

$$\Phi_{1k(i)}^{(i)}(\beta^i S_i, \beta^{n-i} S_{n-i}, \beta^n P) \geq 0$$

and

$$\Phi_{2k(i)}^{(i)}(\beta^i S_i, \beta^{n-i} S_{n-i}, \beta^n P) \geq 0$$

is equivalent to

$$k(i)^2(I - P^*P) + (S_i^*S_i - S_{n-i}^*S_{n-i}) - k(i)\beta^i(S_i - S_{n-i}^*P) - k(i)\bar{\beta}^i(S_i^* - P^*S_{n-i}) \geq 0 \quad (4.8)$$

and

$$k(i)^2(I - P^*P) + (S_{n-i}^*S_{n-i} - S_i^*S_i) - k(i)\beta^{n-i}(S_{n-i} - S_i^*P) - k(i)\bar{\beta}^{n-i}(S_{n-i}^* - P^*S_i) \geq 0 \quad (4.9)$$

for all $\beta \in \mathbb{T}$ with $k(i) \geq \binom{n-1}{i} + \binom{n-1}{n-i}$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$. Since P is isometry, we have

$$(S_i^*S_i - S_{n-i}^*S_{n-i}) - k(i)\beta^i(S_i - S_{n-i}^*P) - k(i)\bar{\beta}^i(S_i^* - P^*S_{n-i}) \geq 0 \quad (4.10)$$

and

$$(S_{n-i}^*S_{n-i} - S_i^*S_i) - k(i)\beta^{n-i}(S_{n-i} - S_i^*P) - k(i)\bar{\beta}^{n-i}(S_{n-i}^* - P^*S_i) \geq 0 \quad (4.11)$$

for all $\beta \in \mathbb{T}$ with $k(i) \geq \binom{n-1}{i} + \binom{n-1}{n-i}$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$. Putting $\beta^i = 1$ and $\beta^i = -1$ respectively in Equation 4.10 and adding them, we have

$$S_i^*S_i - S_{n-i}^*S_{n-i} \geq 0 \quad (4.12)$$

for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$. Again, putting $\beta^{n-i} = 1$ and $\beta^{n-i} = -1$ respectively in Equation 4.11 and adding them, we have

$$S_i^*S_i - S_{n-i}^*S_{n-i} \leq 0 \quad (4.13)$$

for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$. Combining Equation 4.12 and Equation 4.13 we have $S_i^* S_i = S_{n-i}^* S_{n-i}$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$. Equation 4.10 is equivalent to $\operatorname{Re} \beta^i (S_i - S_{n-i}^* P) \leq 0$ for all $\beta \in \mathbb{T}$ and for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$. Hence, we get $S_i = S_{n-i}^* P$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$. Therefore, we have

$$\Phi_{1k(i)}^{(i)}(\beta^i S_i, \beta^{n-i} S_{n-i}, \beta^n P) = 0$$

and

$$\Phi_{2k(i)}^{(i)}(\beta^i S_i, \beta^{n-i} S_{n-i}, \beta^n p) = 0$$

for all $\beta \in \mathbb{T}$ with $k(i) \geq \binom{n-1}{i} + \binom{n-1}{n-i}$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$. Again since $(S_1, \dots, P)$ is a Γ_n -contraction, we have $\|S_i\| \leq \binom{n-1}{i} + \binom{n-1}{n-i}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$. Thus, (5) implies (6).

Suppose (6) holds. Then

$$\Phi_{1k(i)}^{(i)}(\beta^i S_i, \beta^{n-i} S_{n-i}, \beta^n P) = 0$$

and

$$\Phi_{2k(i)}^{(i)}(\beta^i S_i, \beta^{n-i} S_{n-i}, \beta^n p) = 0$$

for all $\beta \in \mathbb{T}$ with $k(i) \geq \binom{n-1}{i} + \binom{n-1}{n-i}$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$. The condition

$$\Phi_{1k(i)}^{(i)}(\beta^i S_i, \beta^{n-i} S_{n-i}, \beta^n P) = 0$$

and

$$\Phi_{2k(i)}^{(i)}(\beta^i S_i, \beta^{n-i} S_{n-i}, \beta^n p) = 0$$

is equivalent to

$$k(i)^2(I - P^*P) + (S_i^* S_i - S_{n-i}^* S_{n-i}) - k(i)\beta^i(S_i - S_{n-i}^* P) - k(i)\bar{\beta}^i(S_i^* - P^* S_{n-i}) = 0 \quad (4.14)$$

and

$$k(i)^2(I - P^*P) + (S_{n-i}^* S_{n-i} - S_i^* S_i) - k(i)\beta^{n-i}(S_{n-i} - S_i^* P) - k(i)\bar{\beta}^{n-i}(S_{n-i}^* - P^* S_i) = 0 \quad (4.15)$$

for all $\beta \in \mathbb{T}$ with $k(i) \geq \binom{n-1}{i} + \binom{n-1}{n-i}$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$. Putting $\beta^i = 1$ and $\beta^i = -1$ respectively in Equation 4.14 and adding them, we have

$$k(i)^2(I - P^*P) + S_i^* S_i - S_{n-i}^* S_{n-i} = 0 \quad (4.16)$$

for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$. Again, putting $\beta^{n-i} = 1$ and $\beta^{n-i} = -1$ respectively in Equation 4.15 and adding them, we have

$$k(i)^2(I - P^*P) - (S_i^* S_i - S_{n-i}^* S_{n-i}) = 0 \quad (4.17)$$

for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$. Again adding Equation 4.16 and Equation 4.17, we obtain $k(i)^2(I - P^*P) = 0$, implies that P is a isometry. Since P is isometry, using same argument as above one can also conclude that $S_i^* S_i = S_{n-i}^* S_{n-i}$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$. Therefore, from Equation 4.14 and Equation 4.15, we have $\operatorname{Re} \beta^i (S_i - S_{n-i}^* P) = 0$ and $\operatorname{Re} \beta^{n-i} (S_{n-i} - S_i^* P) = 0$ for all $\beta \in \mathbb{T}$ and for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$. Hence, we get $S_i = S_{n-i}^* P$ and $S_{n-i} = S_i^* P$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$. Thus, (6) implies (3).

Now we will prove that (6) is equivalent to (7). Suppose (6) holds. Then

$$\Phi_{1k(i)}^{(i)}(\beta^i S_i, \beta^{n-i} S_{n-i}, \beta^n P) = 0$$

and

$$\Phi_{2k(i)}^{(i)}(\beta^i S_i, \beta^{n-i} S_{n-i}, \beta^n p) = 0$$

for all $\beta \in \mathbb{T}$ with $k(i) \geq \binom{n-1}{i} + \binom{n-1}{n-i}$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$. The condition

$$\Phi_{1k(i)}^{(i)}(\beta^i S_i, \beta^{n-i} S_{n-i}, \beta^n P) = 0$$

and

$$\Phi_{2k(i)}^{(i)}(\beta^i S_i, \beta^{n-i} S_{n-i}, \beta^n p) = 0$$

is equivalent to

$$(k(i) - \beta^i S_i)^*(k(i) - \beta^i S_i) - (k(i)\beta^n P - \beta^{n-i} S_{n-i})^*(k(i)\beta^n P - \beta^{n-i} S_{n-i}) = 0 \quad (4.18)$$

and

$$(k(i) - \beta^{n-i} S_{n-i})^* (k(i) - \beta^{n-i} S_{n-i}) - (k(i) \beta^n P - \beta^i S_i)^* (k(i) \beta^n P - \beta^i S_i) = 0 \quad (4.19)$$

for all $\beta \in \mathbb{T}$ with $k(i) \geq \binom{n-1}{i} + \binom{n-1}{n-i}$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$. Since $r(S_i) < \binom{n-1}{i} + \binom{n-1}{n-i}$, $r(S_{n-i}) < \binom{n-1}{i} + \binom{n-1}{n-i}$ and $k(i) \geq \binom{n-1}{i} + \binom{n-1}{n-i}$ we have $(k(i) - \beta^i S_i)$ and $(k(i) - \beta^{n-i} S_{n-i})$ are invertible for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$. Therefore from Equation 4.18 and Equation 4.19, we conclude that $(k(i) \beta^i P - S_{n-i})(k(i) - \beta^i S_i)^{-1}$ and $(k(i) \beta^{n-i} P - S_i)(k(i) - \beta^{n-i} S_{n-i})^{-1}$ are isometry for all $\beta \in \mathbb{T}$ and for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$.

Conversely, suppose (7) holds. Then from Equation 4.18 and Equation 4.19, we also conclude that

$$\Phi_{1k(i)}^{(i)}(\beta^i S_i, \beta^{n-i} S_{n-i}, \beta^n P) = 0$$

and

$$\Phi_{2k(i)}^{(i)}(\beta^i S_i, \beta^{n-i} S_{n-i}, \beta^n p) = 0$$

for all $\beta \in \mathbb{T}$ with $k(i) \geq \binom{n-1}{i} + \binom{n-1}{n-i}$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$. Thus (6) is equivalent to (7). Combining all we conclude that all the above conditions are equivalent. $\square$

By Wold decomposition theorem, an isometry can be decomposed into two parts; a unitary and a pure isometry. In [21], a model for Γ_n pure isometry have been described. For the sake of completeness, we will state as a following proposition.

Proposition 4.4. (Theorem-4.10,[21]) *Let $S_1, \dots, S_{n-1}, P$ be commuting operators on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$. Then $(S_1, \dots, S_{n-1}, P)$ is a pure Γ_n isometry if and only if there exist a separable Hilbert space Σ and a unitary operator $U : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow H^2(\Sigma)$ and function $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_{n-1}$ in $H^\infty(\mathcal{B}(\Sigma))$ and operators $E_i \in \mathcal{B}(\Sigma)$, $i = 1, \dots, n-1$ such that*

- (1) $S_i = U^* M_{\varphi_i} U$, $i = 1, \dots, n-1$, $P = U^* M_z U$;
- (2) $\varphi_i(z) = E_i + E_{n-i}^* z$ for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$;
- (3) $\|E_i + E_{n-i}^* z\| \leq \binom{n-1}{i} + \binom{n-1}{n-i}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$;
- (4) $[E_i, E_j] = 0$ and $[E_i, E_{n-j}^*] = [E_j, E_{n-i}^*]$ for $i, j = 1, \dots, n-1$.

5. A NECESSARY CONDITION FOR THE EXISTENCE OF DILATION

In this section we will find out the necessary conditions for the existence of rational dilation. First, we will define Γ_n isometric dilation of Γ_n -contraction. In [53], several properties of Γ_3 -isometric dilation of Γ_n -contractions have been described. In this section we shall want to extend this properties for the case of arbitrary n .

Definition 5.1. Let $(S_1, \dots, S_{n-1}, P)$ be a Γ_n -contraction on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$. A commuting n -tuples $(T_1, \dots, T_{n-1}, V)$ defined on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{K}$ containing $\mathcal{H}$ as subspace, is said to be Γ_n -isometric dilation of $(S_1, \dots, S_{n-1}, P)$ if it satisfies the following properties:

- $(T_1, \dots, T_{n-1}, V)$ is Γ_n -isometric
- $P_{\mathcal{H}} T_1^{m_1} \dots T_{n-1}^{m_{n-1}} V^n |_{\mathcal{H}} = S_1^{m_1} \dots S_{n-1}^{m_{n-1}} P^n$, for all non-negative integers $m_1, \dots, m_{n-1}, n$.

If $\mathcal{K} = \overline{\text{span}}\{T_1^{m_1} \dots T_{n-1}^{m_{n-1}} V^n h : h \in \mathcal{H} \text{ and } m_1, \dots, m_{n-1}, n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}\}$, then we call the n -tuples a minimal Γ_n -isometric dilation of $(S_1, \dots, P)$. Similarly we can define Γ_n -unitary dilation of a Γ_n -contraction.

Proposition 5.2. *Let $(S_1, \dots, S_{n-1}, P)$ be a Γ_n -contraction defined on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$. Assume that $(S_1, \dots, S_{n-1}, P)$ has a Γ_n -isometric dilation. Then $(S_1, \dots, S_{n-1}, P)$ has a minimal Γ_n -isometric dilation.*

Proof. Let $(T_1, \dots, T_{n-1}, V)$ defined on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{K}$ containing $\mathcal{H}$ as a subspace, be a Γ_n -isometric dilation of $(S_1, \dots, S_{n-1}, P)$. Let $\mathcal{K}_0$ be the space defined by

$$\mathcal{K}_0 = \overline{\text{span}}\{T_1^{m_1} \dots T_{n-1}^{m_{n-1}} V^n h : h \in \mathcal{H} \text{ and } m_1, \dots, m_{n-1}, n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}\}.$$

One can easily verify that $\mathcal{K}_0$ is invariant under $T_1^{m_1}, \dots, T_{n-1}^{m_{n-1}}, V^n$, for any non-negative integers $m_1, \dots, m_{n-1}, n$. If we denote $T_{11} = T_1 |_{\mathcal{K}_0}, \dots, T_{1(n-1)} = T_{n-1} |_{\mathcal{K}_0}$ and $V_1 = V |_{\mathcal{K}_0}$, then we get

$$\mathcal{K}_0 = \overline{\text{span}}\{T_{11}^{m_1} \dots T_{1(n-1)}^{m_{n-1}} V_1^n h : h \in \mathcal{H} \text{ and } m_1, \dots, m_{n-1}, n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}\}.$$

Therefore for any any non-negative integers $m_1, \dots, m_{n-1}, n$ we have

$$P_{\mathcal{H}}(T_1^{m_1} \dots T_{n-1}^{m_{n-1}} V^n)h = P_{\mathcal{H}}(T_{11}^{m_1} \dots T_{1(n-1)}^{m_{n-1}} V_1^n)h \text{ for all } h \in \mathcal{H}.$$

$(T_{11}, \dots, T_{1(n-1)}, V_1)$ is a Γ_n -contraction, because it is the restriction of a Γ_n -contraction $(T_1, \dots, V)$ to a common invariant subspace $\mathcal{K}_0$. Again, V_1 is also isometry, because it is the restriction of an isometry to a common invariant subspace $\mathcal{K}_0$. Therefore, by Theorem 4.3, $(T_{11}, \dots, T_{1(n-1)}, V_1)$ is a Γ_n -isometry. Hence $(T_{11}, \dots, T_{1(n-1)}, V_1)$ is a minimal Γ_n -isometry of $(S_1, \dots, P)$. $\square$

Proposition 5.3. *Let $(T_1, \dots, T_{n-1}, V)$ be n -tuples of operators defined on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{K}$ containing $\mathcal{H}$ as a subspace. Then $(T_1, \dots, T_{n-1}, V)$ is a minimal Γ_n -isometric dilation of a Γ_n -contraction $(S_1, \dots, S_{n-1}, P)$ if and only if $(T_1^*, \dots, T_{n-1}^*, V^*)$ is a Γ_n -co-isometric extension of $(S_1^*, \dots, S_{n-1}^*, P^*)$.*

Proof. We will first prove that $S_i P_{\mathcal{H}} = P_{\mathcal{H}} T_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$ and $PP_{\mathcal{H}} = P_{\mathcal{H}} V$, where $P_{\mathcal{H}} : \mathcal{K} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ is orthogonal projection onto $\mathcal{H}$. It is also evident that

$$\mathcal{K} = \overline{\text{span}}\{T_1^{m_1} \dots T_{n-1}^{m_{n-1}} V^n h : h \in \mathcal{H} \text{ and } m_1, \dots, m_{n-1}, n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}\}.$$

Also, for $h \in \mathcal{H}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} S_i P_{\mathcal{H}}(T_1^{m_1} \dots T_{n-1}^{m_{n-1}} V^n h) &= S_i(S_1^{m_1} \dots S_{n-1}^{m_{n-1}} P^n h) = (S_1^{m_1} \dots S_i^{m_i+1} \dots S_{n-1}^{m_{n-1}} P^n h) \\ &= P_{\mathcal{H}}(T_1^{m_1} \dots T_i^{m_i+1} \dots T_{n-1}^{m_{n-1}} V^n h) \\ &= P_{\mathcal{H}} T_i(T_1^{m_1} \dots T_{n-1}^{m_{n-1}} V^n h) \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have $S_i P_{\mathcal{H}} = P_{\mathcal{H}} T_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$. Similarly we can also prove that $PP_{\mathcal{H}} = P_{\mathcal{H}} V$. Now for any $h \in \mathcal{H}$ and for $k \in \mathcal{K}$ we get

$$\langle S_i^* h, k \rangle = \langle P_{\mathcal{H}} S_i^* h, k \rangle = \langle S_1^* h, P_{\mathcal{H}} k \rangle = \langle h, S_i P_{\mathcal{H}} k \rangle = \langle h, P_{\mathcal{H}} T_i k \rangle = \langle T_i^* h, k \rangle.$$

Thus, we have $S_i^* = T_i^*|_{\mathcal{H}}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$. Similarly, we can also show that $P^* = V^*|_{\mathcal{H}}$.

One can easily verify the converse part. We leave the details to the reader. $\square$

Proposition 5.4. *Let $\mathcal{H}_1$ be a Hilbert space and let $(S_1, \dots, S_{n-1}, P)$ be a Γ_n -contraction on $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_1 \oplus \mathcal{H}_2$ with $n-1$ tuples of fundamental operators $(E_1, \dots, E_{n-1})$ and P is such that*

- (1) $\ker(D_P) = \mathcal{H}_1 \oplus \{0\}$ and $\mathcal{D}_P = \{0\} \oplus \mathcal{H}_1$;
- (2) $P(\mathcal{D}_P) = \{0\}$ and $P \ker(D_P) \subseteq \mathcal{D}_P$.

Suppose that $(S_1^*, \dots, S_{n-1}^*, P^*)$ has Γ_n -isometric dilation. Then the $n-1$ tuples of fundamental operators $(E_1, \dots, E_{n-1})$ satisfies the following conditions:

- (1) $[E_i, E_j] = 0$, where $[P, Q] = PQ - QP$;
- (2) $[E_i, E_{n-j}^*] = [E_j, E_{n-i}^*]$ for $1 \leq i, j \leq n-1$.

Proof. Let $(T_1, \dots, T_{n-1}, V)$ on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{K}$ containing $\mathcal{H}$ as a subspace, be a minimal Γ_n -isometric dilation of $(S_1^*, \dots, S_{n-1}^*, P^*)$ (the existence of such minimal Γ_n -isometric dilation follows from Proposition 5.2). By Proposition-5.3, we conclude that $(T_1^*, \dots, T_{n-1}^*, V^*)$ is a Γ_n -co-isometric extension of $(S_1, \dots, S_{n-1}, P)$. Since $(T_1, \dots, T_{n-1}, V)$ on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{K}$, is a Γ_n -isometry, by Theorem 4.3, we have

$$(T_1, \dots, T_{n-1}, V) = (T_1^{(1)}, \dots, T_{n-1}^{(1)}, U^{(1)}) \oplus (T_1^{(2)}, \dots, T_{n-1}^{(2)}, V^{(2)}) \text{ on } \mathcal{K}_1 \oplus \mathcal{K}_2,$$

where $(T_1^{(1)}, \dots, T_{n-1}^{(1)}, U^{(1)})$ on $\mathcal{K}_1$ is a Γ_n -unitary and $(T_1^{(2)}, \dots, T_{n-1}^{(2)}, V^{(2)})$ on $\mathcal{K}_2$ is a pure Γ_n -isometry. Since $(T_1^{(2)}, \dots, T_{n-1}^{(2)}, V^{(2)})$ on $\mathcal{K}_2$ is a pure Γ_n -isometry, by Theorem, $\mathcal{K}_2$ can be identified with $H^2(E) \cong H^2(\mathbb{D}) \otimes E$ and $T_1^{(2)}, \dots, T_{n-1}^{(2)}, V^{(2)}$ can be identified with the multiplication operators $M_{\varphi_1}, \dots, M_{\varphi_{n-1}}, M_z$ on $H^2(E)$ for some $\varphi_i \in H^\infty(\mathcal{B}(E))$ for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$, where $\varphi_i(z) = A_i + A_{n-i}^* z$ for $i = 1, \dots, n-1, z \in \mathbb{D}, E = \mathcal{D}_{V^{(2)*}}$ and $(A_1^*, \dots, A_{n-1}^*)$ is the $n-1$ -tuples of fundamental operators of $(T_1^{(2)*}, \dots, T_{n-1}^{(2)*}, V^{(2)*})$. Since $H^2(E) \cong H^2(\mathbb{D}) \otimes E$, therefore we have

$$M_{\varphi_i} = \begin{bmatrix} A_i & 0 & 0 & \dots \\ A_{n-i}^* & A_i & 0 & \dots \\ 0 & A_{n-i}^* & A_i & \dots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{bmatrix} \text{ and } M_z = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots \\ I & 0 & 0 & \dots \\ 0 & I & 0 & \dots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{bmatrix}$$

for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$.

We will first prove $\mathcal{D}_P \subseteq E \oplus \{0\} \oplus \dots \subseteq H^2(E) = \mathcal{K}_2$. To prove this, let $h = h_1 \oplus h_2 \in \mathcal{D}_P \subseteq \mathcal{H}$, where $h_1 \in \mathcal{K}_1$ and $(c_0, c_1, \dots)^T \in H^2(E)$. Since $P(\mathcal{D}_P) = \{0\}$, we get

$$Ph = V^*h = V^*(h_1 \oplus h_2) = U^{(1)*}h_1 \oplus M_z^*h_2 = U^{(1)*}h_1 \oplus (c_1, c_2, \dots)^T.$$

Since $U^{(1)}$ is unitary, we have $h_1 = 0$ and $c_1 = c_2 = \dots = 0$.

Now we will prove that $\ker(D_P) \subseteq \{0\} \oplus E \oplus \{0\} \oplus \dots \subseteq H^2(E)$. To prove this, take $k = k_1 \oplus k_2 \in \ker(D_P) \subseteq \mathcal{H}$, where $k_1 \in \mathcal{K}_1$ and $k_2 = (g_0, g_1, \dots)^T \in H^2(E)$, we have $D_P^2 k = 0$. Now,

$$\begin{aligned} D_P^2 k &= (I - P^*P)k = P_{\mathcal{H}}(I - VV^*)k = P_{\mathcal{H}}(k_1 \oplus k_2 - k_1 \oplus M_z M_z^* k_2) \\ &= k_1 \oplus (g_0, g_1, \dots)^T - P_{\mathcal{H}}(k_1 \oplus (0, g_1, \dots)^T). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we conclude that the condition $D_P^2 k = 0$ implies that $k_1 \oplus (g_0, g_1, \dots)^T = P_{\mathcal{H}}(k_1 \oplus (0, g_1, \dots)^T)$. Since $\|k_1 \oplus (g_0, g_1, \dots)^T\| = \|P_{\mathcal{H}}(k_1 \oplus (0, g_1, \dots)^T)\|$, we have $\|k_1 \oplus (g_0, g_1, \dots)^T\| \leq \|k_1 \oplus (0, g_1, \dots)^T\|$, which implies that $g_0 = 0$.

Since $P \ker(D_P) \subseteq \mathcal{D}_P$, we have for every $k = k_1 \oplus (0, g_1, \dots)^T \in \ker(D_P)$,

$$P(k_1 \oplus (0, g_1, \dots)^T) = U^{(1)*}k_1 \oplus (g_1, g_2, \dots)^T \in \mathcal{D}_P.$$

Also, since $P(\mathcal{D}_P) = \{0\}$, from above we conclude that $k_1 = 0$ and $g_2 = g_3 = \dots = 0$. Hence, $\ker(D_P) \subseteq \{0\} \oplus E \oplus \{0\} \oplus \dots \subseteq H^2(E)$.

Since $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{D}_P \oplus \ker(D_P)$, we have $\mathcal{H} \subseteq E \oplus E \oplus \{0\} \oplus \dots \subseteq H^2(E)$. Therefore, $(M_{\varphi_1}^*, \dots, M_{\varphi_{n-1}}^*, M_z^*)$ on $H^2(E)$ is a Γ_n -co-isometric extension of $(S_1, \dots, S_{n-1}, P)$. We now compute the fundamental operator pairs of $(M_{\varphi_1}^*, \dots, M_{\varphi_{n-1}}^*, M_z^*)$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} M_{\varphi_i}^* - M_{\varphi_{n-i}} M_z^* &= \begin{bmatrix} A_i^* & A_{n-i} & 0 & \dots \\ 0 & A_i^* & A_{n-i} & \dots \\ 0 & 0 & A_i^* & \dots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} 0 & A_{n-i} & 0 & \dots \\ 0 & A_i^* & A_{n-i} & \dots \\ 0 & 0 & A_i^* & \dots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} A_i^* & 0 & 0 & \dots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

for $i = i, \dots, n-1$. Similarly one can also prove that

$$M_{\varphi_{n-i}}^* - M_{\varphi_i} M_z^* = \begin{bmatrix} A_{n-i}^* & 0 & 0 & \dots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{bmatrix} \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, n-1.$$

Also, we have

$$\begin{aligned} D_{M_z^*}^2 &= I - M_z M_z^* \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 & 0 & \dots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{bmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we get $\mathcal{D}_{M_z^*} = E \oplus \{0\} \oplus \dots$ and $D_{M_z^*}^2 = D_{M_z^*} = I_d$ on $E \oplus \{0\} \oplus \dots$. If we consider

$$\hat{E}_i = \begin{bmatrix} A_i^* & 0 & 0 & \dots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{bmatrix} \text{ and } \hat{E}_{n-i} = \begin{bmatrix} A_{n-i}^* & 0 & 0 & \dots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{bmatrix} \quad (5.1)$$

for $i = i, \dots, n-1$, then we have

$$M_{\varphi_i}^* - M_{\varphi_{n-i}} M_z^* = D_{M_z^*} \hat{E}_i D_{M_z^*} \text{ and } M_{\varphi_{n-i}}^* - M_{\varphi_i} M_z^* = D_{M_z^*} \hat{E}_{n-i} D_{M_z^*}, \quad (5.2)$$

for $i = i, \dots, n-1$. Therefore, we conclude that $\hat{E}_1, \dots, \hat{E}_{n-1}$ are the $n-1$ -tuples of fundamental operators of $(M_{\varphi_1}^*, \dots, M_{\varphi_{n-1}}^*, M_z^*)$.

Now we will prove that $\hat{E}_i D_{M_z^*} |_{\mathcal{D}_P} \subseteq \mathcal{D}_P$ and $\hat{E}_i^* D_{M_z^*} |_{\mathcal{D}_P} \subseteq \mathcal{D}_P$ for $i = i, \dots, n-1$. To prove this, let $h = (c_0, 0, \dots)^T \in \mathcal{D}_P$. Then $\hat{E}_i M_z^* h = (A_i^* c_0, 0, \dots)^T = M_{\varphi_i}^* h$. Since $M_{\varphi_i}^* |_{\mathcal{H}} = S_i, M_{\varphi_i}^* h \in \mathcal{H}$. Therefore, $(A_i^* c_0, 0, \dots)^T \in \mathcal{D}_P$. Hence $\hat{E}_i D_{M_z^*} |_{\mathcal{D}_P} \subseteq \mathcal{D}_P$ for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$.

Now we compute the adjoint of P . Let $(c_0, c_1, 0, \dots)^T$ and $(d_0, d_1, 0, \dots)^T$ be two arbitrary elements in $\mathcal{H}$, where $(c_0, 0, 0, \dots)^T, (d_0, 0, 0, \dots)^T \in \mathcal{D}_P$ and $(0, c_1, 0, \dots)^T, (0, d_1, 0, \dots)^T \in \ker(D_P)$. Now, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle P^*(c_0, c_1, 0, \dots)^T, (d_0, d_1, 0, \dots)^T \rangle &= \langle (c_0, c_1, 0, \dots)^T, P(d_0, d_1, 0, \dots)^T \rangle \\ &= (c_0, c_1, 0, \dots)^T, M_z^*(d_0, d_1, 0, \dots)^T \rangle \\ &= \langle (c_0, c_1, 0, \dots)^T, (d_1, 0, \dots)^T \rangle \\ &= \langle c_0, d_1 \rangle_E \\ &= \langle (0, c_0, c_1, 0, \dots)^T, (d_0, d_1, 0, \dots)^T \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we get $P^*(c_0, c_1, 0, \dots)^T = (0, c_0, c_1, 0, \dots)^T$. Now, $h_0 = (c_0, 0, 0, \dots)^T \in \mathcal{D}_P$ implies that $P^*h_0 = (0, c_0, 0, \dots)^T \in \mathcal{H}$ and $\hat{E}_i^* D_{M_z^*} h_0 = (A_i^* c_0, 0, \dots)^T = M_{\varphi_{n-i}}^*(0, c_0, 0, \dots)^T$ for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$. Since $(A_i^* c_0, 0, \dots)^T \in \mathcal{D}_P$, we have $\hat{E}_i^* D_{M_z^*} |_{\mathcal{D}_P} \subseteq \mathcal{D}_P$ for $i = i, \dots, n-1$.

Now we will prove $\hat{E}_i |_{\mathcal{D}_P} = E_i$ and $\hat{E}_i^* |_{\mathcal{D}_P} = E_i^*$ for $i = i, \dots, n-1$.

Since $M_z^* |_{\mathcal{H}} = P, \mathcal{D}_P \subseteq \mathcal{M}_z^* = E \oplus \{0\} \oplus \dots$ and $D_{M_z^*}$ is the projection onto $\mathcal{D}_{M_z^*}$, we have $D_{M_z^*} |_{\mathcal{H}} = D_{M_z^*}^2 |_{\mathcal{D}_P} = D_P^2$. From Equation 5.2, we get

$$P_{\mathcal{H}}(M_{\varphi_i}^* - M_{\varphi_{n-i}} M_z^*) |_{\mathcal{H}} = P_{\mathcal{H}} D_{M_z^*} \hat{E}_i D_{M_z^*} |_{\mathcal{H}}, \quad (5.3)$$

for $i = i, \dots, n-1$. Since $(M_{\varphi_1}^*, \dots, M_{\varphi_{n-1}}^*, M_z^*)$ on $H^2(E)$ is a Γ_n -co-isometric extension of $(S_1, \dots, S_{n-1}, P)$, from Equation 5.3, we conclude that

$$S_i - S_{n-i}^* P = P_{\mathcal{H}} D_{M_z^*} \hat{E}_i D_{M_z^*} |_{\mathcal{H}}, \quad (5.4)$$

for $i = i, \dots, n-1$. Again since $(E_1, \dots, E_{n-1})$ are $n-1$ tuples of fundamental operators of $(S_1, \dots, S_{n-1}, P)$, we have

$$S_i - S_{n-i}^* P = D_P E_i D_P, \quad F_i \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{D}_P) \quad (5.5)$$

for $i = i, \dots, n-1$. Since $S_i - S_{n-i}^* P$ is zero on the orthogonal complement of $\mathcal{D}_P$, $D_{M_z^*} |_{\mathcal{D}_P} = D_P$ and $\hat{E}_i D_{M_z^*} |_{\mathcal{D}_P} \subseteq \mathcal{D}_P$, from Equation 5.4 we get

$$S_i - S_{n-i}^* P = P_{\mathcal{H}}(M_{\varphi_i}^* - M_{\varphi_{n-i}} M_z^*) |_{\mathcal{H}} = P_{\mathcal{H}} D_{M_z^*} \hat{E}_i D_{M_z^*} |_{\mathcal{H}} = D_P \hat{E}_i D_P, \quad (5.6)$$

for $i = i, \dots, n-1$. By uniqueness of E_i for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$, we have $\hat{E}_i |_{\mathcal{D}_P} = E_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$. Similarly, one can prove also $\hat{E}_i^* |_{\mathcal{D}_P} = E_i^*$ for $i = i, \dots, n-1$. We leave the details to the reader.

Also, since $M_{\varphi_i}^*$'s are commute, we have

$$M_{\varphi_{n-i}}^* M_{\varphi_{n-j}}^* = M_{\varphi_{n-j}}^* M_{\varphi_{n-i}}^* \text{ for } i, j = 1, \dots, n-1.$$

The above condition is equivalent to for $i, j = 1, \dots, n-1$,

$$\begin{bmatrix} A_{n-i}^* & A_i & 0 & \dots \\ 0 & A_{n-i}^* & A_i & \dots \\ 0 & 0 & A_{n-i}^* & \dots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} A_{n-j}^* & A_j & 0 & \dots \\ 0 & A_{n-j}^* & A_j & \dots \\ 0 & 0 & A_{n-j}^* & \dots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} A_{n-j}^* & A_j & 0 & \dots \\ 0 & A_{n-j}^* & A_j & \dots \\ 0 & 0 & A_{n-j}^* & \dots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} A_{n-i}^* & A_i & 0 & \dots \\ 0 & A_{n-i}^* & A_i & \dots \\ 0 & 0 & A_{n-i}^* & \dots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{bmatrix}.$$

Equivalently,

$$\begin{bmatrix} A_{n-i}^* A_{n-j}^* & A_{n-i}^* A_j + A_i A_{n-j}^* & 0 & \dots \\ 0 & A_{n-i}^* A_{n-j}^* & A_{n-i}^* A_j + A_i A_{n-j}^* & \dots \\ 0 & 0 & A_{n-i}^* A_{n-j}^* & \dots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} A_{n-j}^* A_{n-i}^* & A_{n-j}^* A_i + A_j A_{n-i}^* & 0 & \dots \\ 0 & A_{n-j}^* A_{n-i}^* & A_{n-j}^* A_i + A_j A_{n-i}^* & \dots \\ 0 & 0 & A_{n-j}^* A_{n-i}^* & \dots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{bmatrix}$$

for $i, j = 1, \dots, n-1$. Comparing both sides we get

- (1) $[A_{n-i}^*, A_{n-j}^*] = 0$ for $i, j = 1, \dots, n-1$;
- (2) $[A_i, A_{n-j}^*] = [A_j, A_{n-i}^*]$ for $i, j = 1, \dots, n-1$.

Therefore, from Equation 5.1 we have

- (1) $[\hat{E}_{n-i}, \hat{E}_{n-j}] = 0$ for $i, j = 1, \dots, n-1$;
- (2) $[\hat{E}_i, \hat{E}_{n-j}^*] = [\hat{E}_j, \hat{E}_{n-i}^*]$ for $i, j = 1, \dots, n-1$.

Taking restriction to the above identities to the subspace $\mathcal{D}_P$ we get

- (1) $[E_{n-i}, E_{n-j}] = 0$ for $i, j = 1, \dots, n-1$;
- (2) $[E_i, E_{n-j}^*] = [E_j, E_{n-i}^*]$ for $i, j = 1, \dots, n-1$.

This completes the proof. □

6. CONDITIONAL DILATION

Dilating a contraction operator to an unitary is well studied in the history of dilation theory [18]. In [53], it is shown that if the pair of fundamental operators E_1, E_2 do not satisfy the conditions $E_1 E_1^* - E_2 E_2^* = E_1^* E_1 - E_2^* E_2$, then (S_1, S_2, P) do not have a Γ_3 -unitary dilation. In [53], S. Pal also proved that if the pair of commuting tuple of Fundamental Operators E_1, E_2 and F_1, F_2 of a Γ_3 -contractions of (S_1, S_2, P) and its adjoint (S_1^*, S_2^*, P^*) respectively, satisfy the conditions $E_1 E_1^* - E_2 E_2^* = E_1^* E_1 - E_2^* E_2$ and $F_1^* F_1 - F_2^* F_2 = F_1 F_1^* - F_2 F_2^*$, then (S_1, S_2, P) posses a Γ_3 -unitary dilation. In this section, we want to generalize this result for arbitrary n , that is, if the commuting $(n-1)$ -tuple of Fundamental Operators $E_1, \dots, E_{n-1}$ and $F_1, \dots, F_{n-1}$ of a Γ_n -contractions of $(S_1, \dots, S_{n-1}, P)$ and its adjoint $(S_1^*, \dots, S_{n-1}^*, P^*)$ respectively, satisfy the conditions $E_l E_{n-k}^* - E_k E_{n-l}^* = E_{n-k}^* E_l - E_{n-l}^* E_k$ and $F_l^* F_{n-k} - F_k^* F_{n-l} = F_{n-k} F_l^* - F_{n-l} F_k^*$, then $(S_1, \dots, S_{n-1}, P)$ posses a Γ_n -unitary dilation. The two conditions of $(n-1)$ -tuple of Fundamental Operators of $(S_1, \dots, S_{n-1}, P)$ and of $(S_1^*, \dots, S_{n-1}^*, P^*)$, mentioned above, are the sufficient to have a such Γ_n -unitary dilation.

Throughout this section, we will use the definitions of $(n-1)$ -tuple of Fundamental Operators, that is,

$$S_i - S_{n-i}^* P = D_P E_i D_P, S_{n-i} - S_i^* P = D_P E_{n-i} D_P \quad (6.1)$$

$$S_i^* - S_{n-i} P^* = D_{P^*} F_i D_{P^*}, S_{n-i}^* - S_i P^* = D_{P^*} F_{n-i} D_{P^*}. \quad (6.2)$$

The following proposition will be used in this section.

Proposition 6.1. [cf.[18], Chapter- I] Suppose P is any contraction on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$. Then $P D_P = D_{P^*} P$.

Lemma 6.2. Let $(S_1, \dots, S_{n-1}, P)$ be a Γ_n -contraction defined on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$. Let $(E_1, \dots, E_{n-1})$ and $(F_1, \dots, F_{n-1})$ be the $(n-1)$ -tuple of Fundamental Operators of $(S_1, \dots, S_{n-1}, P)$ and $(S_1^*, \dots, S_{n-1}^*, P^*)$ respectively. Then the following properties hold:

- (1) $P E_i = F_i^* P|_{\mathcal{D}_P}$ and $P^* F_i = E_i^* P^*|_{\mathcal{D}_{P^*}}$ for $i = 1, \dots, (n-1)$,
- (2) $D_P S_i = E_i D_P + E_{n-i}^* D_P P$ and $D_P S_{n-i} = E_{n-i} D_P + E_i^* D_P P$ for $i = 1, \dots, (n-1)$,
- (3) $S_i D_{P^*} = D_{P^*} F_i^* + P D_{P^*} F_{n-i}$ and $S_{n-i} D_{P^*} = D_{P^*} F_{n-i}^* + P D_{P^*} F_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, (n-1)$,
- (4) $S_{n-j}^* S_i - S_{n-i}^* S_j = D_P (E_{n-j}^* E_i - E_{n-i}^* E_j) D_P$, when $[E_i, E_j] = 0$, for $i, j = 1, \dots, (n-1)$,
- (5) $S_i S_{n-j}^* - S_j S_{n-i}^* = D_{P^*} (F_i^* F_{n-j} - F_j^* F_{n-i}) D_{P^*}$, when $[F_i, F_j] = 0$, for $i, j = 1, \dots, (n-1)$,
- (6) $\omega(E_{n-i} + E_i^* z) \leq \binom{n-1}{i} + \binom{n-1}{n-i}$ and $\omega(F_{n-i}^* + E_i z) \leq \binom{n-1}{i} + \binom{n-1}{n-i}$ for $i = 1, \dots, (n-1)$.

Proof. (1) For $D_P h \in \mathcal{D}_P$ and $D_{P^*} h' \in \mathcal{D}_{P^*}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle P E_i D_P h, D_{P^*} h' \rangle &= \langle D_{P^*} P E_i D_P h, h' \rangle \\ &= \langle D_P P E_i D_P h, h' \rangle \\ &= \langle P (S_i - S_{n-i}^* P) h, h' \rangle \\ &= \langle (S_i - P S_{n-i}^*) P h, h' \rangle \\ &= \langle D_{P^*} F_i^* D_{P^*} P h, h' \rangle \\ &= \langle F_i^* P D_P h, D_{P^*} h' \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, it is very easy to verify the other equality. We leave the details to the reader.

- (2) The proof (2) is also easy to verify. We leave the details to the reader.

- (3) The proof (3) is similar to (2).
 (4) We have

$$\begin{aligned}
 S_{n-j}^* S_i - S_{n-i}^* S_j &= S_{n-j}^* (S_{n-i}^* + D_P E_i D_P) - S_{n-i}^* (S_{n-j}^* + D_P E_j D_P) \\
 &= S_{n-j}^* D_P E_i D_P - S_{n-i}^* D_P E_j D_P \\
 &= (D_P E_{n-j}^* + P^* D_P E_j) E_i D_P \\
 &\quad - (D_P E_{n-i}^* + P^* D_P E_i) E_j D_P \text{ [by part(2) of this lemma]} \\
 &= D_P (E_{n-j}^* E_i - E_{n-i}^* E_j) D_P, \text{ when } [E_i, E_j] = 0.
 \end{aligned}$$

- (5) The proof (5) is same as (4). We leave the details to the reader.
 (6) By Theorem-3.11, we have for all $z \in \mathbb{T}$, $\omega(E_i + E_{n-i}z) \leq \binom{n-1}{i} + \binom{n-1}{n-i}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$. The condition $\omega(E_i + E_{n-i}z) \leq \binom{n-1}{i} + \binom{n-1}{n-i}$, implies that $\omega(E_i^* + E_{n-i}z) \leq \binom{n-1}{i} + \binom{n-1}{n-i}$ for all $z \in \mathbb{T}$ and $i = 1, \dots, n-1$. Similarly, one can also show that $\omega(F_{n-i}^* + E_i z) \leq \binom{n-1}{i} + \binom{n-1}{n-i}$ for $i = 1, \dots, (n-1)$. $\square$

Theorem 6.3. Suppose $(S_1, \dots, S_{n-1}, P)$ is a Γ_n -contraction defined on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ such that the commuting $(n-1)$ -tuple of Fundamental Operators $E_1, \dots, E_{n-1}$ and $F_1, \dots, F_{n-1}$ of $(S_1, \dots, S_{n-1}, P)$ and $(S_1^*, \dots, S_{n-1}^*, P^*)$ respectively satisfy the conditions $E_l E_{n-k}^* - E_k E_{n-l}^* = E_{n-k}^* E_l - E_{n-l}^* E_k$ and $F_l^* F_{n-k} - F_k^* F_{n-l} = F_{n-k} F_l^* - F_{n-l} F_k^*$. Let $\mathcal{K} = \dots \oplus \mathcal{D}_P \oplus \mathcal{D}_P \oplus \mathcal{D}_P \oplus \mathcal{H} \oplus \mathcal{D}_{P^*} \oplus \mathcal{D}_{P^*} \oplus \mathcal{D}_{P^*} \oplus \dots$ and let $(R_1, \dots, R_{n-1}, U)$ be a n -tuples of operators defined on $\mathcal{K}$ by

$$R_i = \left[\begin{array}{cccc|c|ccc|c} \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \\ \dots & E_i & E_{n-i}^* & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots \\ \dots & 0 & E_i & E_{n-i}^* & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots \\ \dots & 0 & 0 & E_i & E_{n-i}^* D_P & -E_{n-i}^* P^* & 0 & 0 & \dots \\ \hline \dots & 0 & 0 & 0 & S_i & D_{P^*} F_{n-i} & 0 & 0 & \dots \\ \dots & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & F_i^* & F_{n-i} & 0 & \dots \\ \dots & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & F_i^* & F_{n-i} & \dots \\ \dots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{array} \right] \quad (6.3)$$

and

$$U = \left[\begin{array}{cccc|c|ccc|c} \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \\ \dots & 0 & I & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots \\ \dots & 0 & 0 & I & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots \\ \dots & 0 & 0 & 0 & D_P & -P^* & 0 & 0 & \dots \\ \hline \dots & 0 & 0 & 0 & P & D_{P^*} & 0 & 0 & \dots \\ \dots & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & I & 0 & \dots \\ \dots & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & I & \dots \\ \dots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{array} \right]. \quad (6.4)$$

Then $(R_1, \dots, R_{n-1}, U)$ is a minimal Γ_n -unitary dilation of $(S_1, \dots, S_{n-1}, P)$.

Proof. It is immediate from Sz.-Nagy-Foias dilation (see Chapter -I, [18]) that U is the minimal unitary dilation of P . The minimality of Γ_n -unitary dilation follows from the fact that $\mathcal{K}$ and U are the minimal dilation space and minimal unitary dilation of P respectively. Since U is unitary, in order to show that $(R_1, \dots, R_{n-1}, U)$ is a minimal Γ_n -unitary dilation of $(S_1, \dots, S_{n-1}, P)$ one has to verify the following:

- (1) $R_i R_j = R_j R_i$ for $i, j = 1, \dots, (n-1)$,
- (2) $R_i U = U R_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, (n-1)$,
- (3) $R_i = R_{n-i}^* U$ for $i = 1, \dots, (n-1)$,
- (4) $\|R_i\| \leq \binom{n-1}{i} + \binom{n-1}{n-i}$ for $i = 1, \dots, (n-1)$.

Step 1: $R_i R_j =$

$$\left[\begin{array}{ccc|ccc} \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \\ \dots & E_i E_j & E_i E_{n-j}^* + E_{n-i}^* E_j & E_{n-i}^* E_{n-j}^* D_P & E_{n-i}^* E_{n-j}^* P^* & 0 & \dots \\ \dots & 0 & E_i E_j & E_i E_{n-j}^* D_P & -E_i E_{n-j}^* P^* & -E_{n-i}^* P^* F_{n-j} & \dots \\ & & & +E_{n-i}^* D_P S_j & +E_{n-i}^* D_P D_{P^*} F_{n-j} & -E_{n-i}^* P^* F_j^* & \\ \hline \dots & 0 & 0 & S_i S_j & S_i D_{P^*} F_{n-j} & D_{P^*} F_{n-i} F_{n-j} & \dots \\ & & & & +D_{P^*} F_{n-i} F_j^* & & \\ \hline \dots & 0 & 0 & 0 & F_i^* F_j^* & F_i^* F_{n-j} & \dots \\ & & & & & +F_{n-i} F_j^* & \\ \hline \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{array} \right]$$

and

$$R_j R_i =$$

$$\left[\begin{array}{ccc|ccc} \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \\ \dots & E_j E_i & E_j E_{n-i}^* + E_{n-j}^* E_i & E_{n-j}^* E_{n-i}^* D_P & E_{n-j}^* E_{n-i}^* P^* & 0 & \dots \\ \dots & 0 & E_j E_i & E_j E_{n-i}^* D_P & -E_j E_{n-i}^* P^* & -E_{n-j}^* P^* F_{n-i} & \dots \\ & & & +E_{n-j}^* D_P S_i & +E_{n-j}^* D_P D_{P^*} F_{n-i} & -E_{n-j}^* P^* F_i^* & \\ \hline \dots & 0 & 0 & S_j S_i & S_j D_{P^*} F_{n-i} & D_{P^*} F_{n-j} F_{n-i} & \dots \\ & & & & +D_{P^*} F_{n-j} F_i^* & & \\ \hline \dots & 0 & 0 & 0 & F_j^* F_i^* & F_j^* F_{n-i} & \dots \\ & & & & & +F_{n-j} F_i^* & \\ \hline \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{array} \right]$$

First we will verify the equality of the entities $(-1, 0), (0, 1), (-1, 1)$ in the matrices of $R_i R_j$ and $R_j R_i$. To show this, we need to check the following operator identities.

- (1) $E_i E_{n-j}^* D_P + E_{n-i}^* D_P S_j = E_j E_{n-i}^* D_P + E_{n-j}^* D_P S_i$
- (2) $-E_i E_{n-j}^* P^* + E_{n-i}^* D_P D_{P^*} F_{n-j} - E_{n-i}^* P^* F_j^*$
 $= -E_j E_{n-i}^* P^* + E_{n-j}^* D_P D_{P^*} F_{n-i} - E_{n-j}^* P^* F_i^*$
- (3) $S_i D_{P^*} F_{n-j} + D_{P^*} F_{n-i} F_j^* = S_j D_{P^*} F_{n-i} + D_{P^*} F_{n-j} F_i^*$

(1). Using Part-(2) of Lemma 6.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} E_i E_{n-j}^* D_P + E_{n-i}^* D_P S_j &= E_i E_{n-j}^* D_P + E_{n-i}^* (E_j D_P + E_{n-j}^* D_P P) \\ &= (E_i E_{n-j}^* D_P + E_{n-i}^* E_j) D_P + E_{n-i}^* E_{n-j}^* D_P P \\ &= (E_j E_{n-i}^* D_P + E_{n-j}^* E_i) D_P + E_{n-i}^* E_{n-j}^* D_P P \\ &= E_j E_{n-i}^* D_P + E_{n-j}^* D_P S_i \end{aligned}$$

(2). By Lemma 6.2, it is easy to see that both of LHS and RHS are defined on $\mathcal{D}_{P^*}$ to $\mathcal{D}_P$. Let $H_1 = -E_i E_{n-j}^* P^* + E_{n-i}^* D_P D_{P^*} F_{n-j} - E_{n-i}^* P^* F_j^*$ and $H_2 = -E_j E_{n-i}^* P^* + E_{n-j}^* D_P D_{P^*} F_{n-i} - E_{n-j}^* P^* F_i^*$. Using

Part-(4), (5) of Lemma 6.2, Equation- (6.2) and Equation -(6.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
D_P(H_2 - H_1)D_{P^*} &= D_P(E_i E_{n-j}^* - E_j E_{n-i}^*)P^*D_{P^*} \\
&\quad + D_P(E_{n-j}^* D_P D_{P^*} F_{n-i} - E_{n-i}^* D_P D_{P^*} F_{n-j})D_{P^*} \\
&\quad + D_P(E_{n-i}^* F_j^* - E_{n-j}^* F_i^*)D_{P^*} \\
&= D_P(E_i E_{n-j}^* - E_j E_{n-i}^*)D_P P^* \\
&\quad + D_P(E_{n-j}^* D_P D_{P^*} F_{n-i} - E_{n-i}^* D_P D_{P^*} F_{n-j})D_{P^*} \\
&\quad + P^* D_{P^*} (F_{n-i} F_j^* - F_{n-j} F_i^*)D_{P^*} \\
&= (S_{n-j}^* S_i - S_{n-i}^* S_j)P^* - P^* (S_i S_{n-j}^* - S_j S_{n-i}^*) \\
&\quad + (S_{n-j}^* - P^* S_j)(S_{n-i}^* - S_i P^*) - (S_{n-i}^* - P^* S_i)(S_{n-j}^* - S_j P^*) \\
&= 0.
\end{aligned}$$

(3). Applying Part-(3) of Lemma 6.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
S_i D_{P^*} F_{n-j} + D_{P^*} F_{n-i} F_j^* &= (D_{P^*} F_i^* + P D_{P^*} F_{n-i})F_{n-j} + D_{P^*} F_{n-i} F_j^* \\
&= D_{P^*} (F_i^* F_{n-j} + F_{n-i} F_j^*) + P D_{P^*} F_{n-i} F_{n-j} \\
&= D_{P^*} (F_j^* F_{n-i} + F_{n-j} F_i^*) + P D_{P^*} F_{n-i} F_{n-j} \\
&= S_j D_{P^*} F_{n-i} + D_{P^*} F_{n-j} F_i^*
\end{aligned}$$

By above given conditions, all other entries of $R_i R_j$ and $R_j R_i$ are equal. Hence, $R_i R_j = R_j R_i$.

Step 2: We will now show that $R_i U = U R_i$. $R_i U =$

$$\left[\begin{array}{cccc|cccc}
\ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & & & & \\
\cdots & 0 & E_i & E_{n-i}^* & 0 & & & & \\
\cdots & 0 & 0 & E_i & E_{n-i}^* D_P & & & & \\
\cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 & E_i D_P + E_{n-i}^* D_P P & -E_i P^* + E_{n-i}^* D_P D_{P^*} & -E_{n-i}^* P^* & 0 & \cdots \\
\hline
\cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 & S_i P & S_i D_{P^*} & D_{P^*} F_{n-i} & 0 & \cdots \\
\hline
\cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & F_i^* & F_{n-i} & \cdots \\
\cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & F_i^* & \cdots \\
\ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots
\end{array} \right]$$

and

$$U R_i =$$

$$\left[\begin{array}{cccc|cccc}
\ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & & & & \\
\cdots & 0 & E_i & E_{n-i}^* & 0 & & & & \\
\cdots & 0 & 0 & E_i & E_{n-i}^* D_P & -E_{n-i}^* P^* & & & \\
\cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 & D_P S_i & D_P D_{P^*} F_{n-i} - P^* F_i^* & -P^* F_{n-i} & 0 & \cdots \\
\hline
\cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 & P S_i & P D_{P^*} F_{n-i} + D_{P^*} F_i^* & D_{P^*} F_{n-i} & 0 & \cdots \\
\hline
\cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & F_i^* & F_{n-i} & \cdots \\
\cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & F_i^* & \cdots \\
\ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots
\end{array} \right]$$

Using Lemma 6.2, it is easy to see that the entities of the positions $(-1, 2)$, $(-1, 0)$ and $(0, 1)$ of $R_i U$ and $U R_i$ are equal. If we can show the equality of

$$-E_i P^* + E_{n-i}^* D_P D_{P^*} = D_P D_{P^*} F_{n-i} - P^* F_i^*, \quad (6.5)$$

then we are done. The LHS and RHS of Equation- (6.5) map $\mathcal{D}_{P^*}$ into $\mathcal{D}_P$. Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
-D_P E_i P^* D_{P^*} + D_P E_{n-i}^* D_P D_{P^*}^2 &= -D_P E_i D_P P^* + D_P E_{n-i}^* D_P D_{P^*}^2 \\
&= -(S_i - S_{n-i}^* P) P^* + (S_{n-i}^* - P^* S_i) (I - P P^*) \\
&= -P^* (S_i - S_{n-i}^*) + (I - P^* P) (S_{n-i}^* - S_i P^*) \\
&= D_P^2 D_{P^*} F_{n-i} D_{P^*} - D_P P^* F_i^* D_{P^*}
\end{aligned}$$

Hence $R_i U = U R_i$.

Step 3: We will now show that $R_i = R_{n-i}^* U$.

$$R_{n-i}^* U =$$

$$\left[\begin{array}{cccc|ccc|cccc}
\ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & & & & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \\
\cdots & 0 & E_i & E_{n-i}^* & 0 & & & & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots \\
\cdots & 0 & 0 & E_i & E_{n-i}^* D_P & & & & -E_{n-i}^* P^* & 0 & 0 & \cdots \\
\hline
\cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 & D_P E_i D_P + S_{n-i}^* P & & & & -D_P E_i P^* + S_{n-i}^* D_{P^*} & 0 & 0 & \cdots \\
\cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 & -P E_i D_P + F_i^* D_{P^*} P & & & & P E_i P^* + F_i^* D_{P^*}^2 & F_{n-i} & 0 & \cdots \\
\cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & & & & 0 & F_i^* & F_{n-i} & \cdots \\
\cdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & & & & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots
\end{array} \right]$$

To prove $R_i = R_{n-i}^* U$, we need to verify the following operator identities:

- (1) $-D_P E_i P^* + S_{n-i}^* D_{P^*} = D_{P^*} F_{n-i}$,
- (2) $P E_i P^* + F_i^* D_{P^*}^2 = F_i^*$.

(1). If we can show that $-D_P E_i P^* D_{P^*} + S_{n-i}^* D_{P^*}^2 = D_{P^*} F_{n-i} D_{P^*}$, then we are done, because the LHS and RHS are defined on $\mathcal{D}_{P^*}$. Now,

$$\begin{aligned}
-D_P E_i P^* D_{P^*} + S_{n-i}^* D_{P^*}^2 &= -(S_i - S_{n-i}^* P) P^* + S_{n-i}^* (I - P P^*) \\
&= S_{n-i}^* - S_i P^* \\
&= D_{P^*} F_{n-i} D_{P^*}
\end{aligned}$$

(2). Using Part-(1) of Lemma 6.2, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
P E_i P^* + F_i^* D_{P^*}^2 &= F_i^* P P^* + F_i^* (I - P P^*) \\
&= F_i^*
\end{aligned}$$

The other equality follow from Lemma 6.2, Equation -(6.2) and Equation- (6.1). Hence, we have $R_i = R_{n-i}^* U$.

Step 4: First we will prove that R_i is normal. Clearly, $R_{n-i} = R_i^* U$. Since $R_i U = U R_i$, using Fugled's theorem [63], we conclude that $R_i^* U = U R_i^*$. Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
R_i R_i^* &= R_{n-i}^* U R_i^* \\
&= R_i^* R_{n-i}^* U \\
&= R_i^* R_i
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have $r(R_i) = \omega(R_i) = \|R_i\|$. Now, we will prove that $\|R_i\| \leq \binom{n-1}{i} + \binom{n-1}{n-i}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$. Suppose

that the matrix R_i with respect to the decomposition $l^2(\mathcal{D}_P) \oplus \mathcal{H} \oplus l^2(\mathcal{D}_{P^*})$ of $\mathcal{K}$ is $\begin{pmatrix} B_1^{(i)} & B_2^{(i)} & B_3^{(i)} \\ 0 & S_i & B_4^{(i)} \\ 0 & 0 & B_5^{(i)} \end{pmatrix}$ for $i =$

$1, \dots, n-1$. Since $E_1, \dots, E_{n-1}$ and $F_1, \dots, F_{n-1}$ are $n-1$ -tuples of fundamental operators of $(S_1, \dots, S_{n-1}, P)$ and $(S_1^*, \dots, S_{n-1}^*, P^*)$ respectively, by part-6 of Lemma 6.2, we conclude that $\omega(E_{n-i} + E_i^* z) \leq \binom{n-1}{i} + \binom{n-1}{n-i}$ and $\omega(F_{n-i}^* + E_i z) \leq \binom{n-1}{i} + \binom{n-1}{n-i}$ for $i = 1, \dots, (n-1)$. Therefore,

$$r(B_1^{(i)}) \leq \binom{n-1}{i} + \binom{n-1}{n-i} \text{ and } r(B_5^{(i)}) \leq \binom{n-1}{i} + \binom{n-1}{n-i}$$

for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$. We have by Lemma-1 of [] that

$$\sigma(R_i) \subseteq \sigma(B_1^{(i)}) \cup \sigma(S_i) \cup \sigma(B_5^{(i)})$$

for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$. Also $\|S_i\| \leq \binom{n-1}{i} + \binom{n-1}{n-i}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$. Hence $r(R_i) \leq \binom{n-1}{i} + \binom{n-1}{n-i}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$. Since R_i 's are normal, we obtain $\|R_i\| \leq \binom{n-1}{i} + \binom{n-1}{n-i}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$. Thus, $(R_1, \dots, U)$ is a Γ_n -unitary. $\square$

Corollary 6.4. *Let $\mathcal{N} \subseteq \mathcal{K}$ be defined as $\mathcal{N} = \mathcal{H} \oplus l^2(\mathcal{D}_P)$. Then $\mathcal{N}$ is a common invariant subspace of $R_1, \dots, R_{n-1}, U$ and $(T_1, \dots, T_{n-1}, V) = (R_1|_{\mathcal{N}}, \dots, R_{n-1}|_{\mathcal{N}}, U|_{\mathcal{N}})$ is a minimal Γ -isometric dilation of $(S_1, \dots, S_{n-1}, P)$.*

Proof. Clearly, $\mathcal{N}$ is a common invariant subspace of $R_1, \dots, R_{n-1}, U$. Therefore, by definition of Γ_n -isometry, the restriction of $(R_1, \dots, R_{n-1}, U)$ to the common invariant subspace $\mathcal{N}$, that is, $(T_1, \dots, T_{n-1}, V)$ is a Γ_n -isometry. The matrices of $T_1, \dots, T_{n-1}, V$ with respect to the decomposition $\mathcal{H} \oplus \mathcal{D}_P \oplus \dots$ of $\mathcal{N}$ are as follows:

$$T_i = \begin{bmatrix} S_i & 0 & 0 & \dots \\ F_{n-i}^* D_P & F_i & 0 & \dots \\ 0 & F_{n-i}^* & F_i & \dots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{bmatrix} \text{ and } V = \begin{bmatrix} P & 0 & 0 & \dots \\ D_P & 0 & 0 & \dots \\ 0 & I & 0 & \dots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{bmatrix}$$

for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$. One can easily check that the adjoint of $(T_1, \dots, T_{n-1}, V)$ is a Γ_n -co-isometry extension of $(S_1^*, \dots, S_{n-1}^*, P^*)$. Hence, by Proposition 5.3, we conclude that $(T_1, \dots, T_{n-1}, V)$ is a Γ_n -isometric dilation of $(S_1, \dots, S_{n-1}, P)$. Since $\mathcal{N}$ and V are the minimal isometric space and minimal isometric dilation of P , the minimality of this Γ_n isometric dilation follows from this fact. This completes the proof. $\square$

Remark 6.5. From Theorem 6.3 and Corollary 6.4, we conclude that $(R_1, \dots, R_{n-1}, U)$ is a minimal Γ_n unitary extension of $(T_1, \dots, T_{n-1}, V)$.

As a consequence the following theorem give a sufficient condition for a n tuples of operators $(S_1, \dots, S_{n-1}, P)$ to become a Γ_n contraction.

Theorem 6.6. *Let $S_1, \dots, S_{n-1}, P$ be a commuting n -tuples of operators on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ with $\|S_i\| \leq \binom{n-1}{i} + \binom{n-1}{n-i}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$ and $\|P\| \leq 1$. Let $E_1, \dots, E_{n-1}$ be commuting $n-1$ tuples of bounded operators on $\mathcal{D}_P$ satisfying the following conditions:*

- (1) $S_i - S_{n-i}^* P = D_P E_i D_P, S_{n-i} - S_i^* P = D_P E_{n-i} D_P$, for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$;
- (2) $[E_i^*, E_j^*] = 0$ for $i, j = 1, \dots, n-1$;
- (3) $[E_i, E_{n-j}^*] = [E_j, E_{n-i}^*]$ for $i, j = 1, \dots, n-1$.

Then Γ_n is a complete spectral set for $(S_1, \dots, S_{n-1}, P)$ and hence $(S_1, \dots, S_{n-1}, P)$ is a Γ_n contraction.

7. A FUNCTIONAL MODEL FOR A CLASS OF Γ_n -CONTRACTIONS

In [53], S. Pal constructed a concrete and explicit functional model for a class of Γ_3 -contractions of (S_1, S_2, P) for which the adjoint (S_1^*, S_2^*, P^*) has commuting pair of fundamental operators (F_1, F_2) with $F_1^* F_1 - F_1 F_1^* = F_2^* F_2 - F_2 F_2^*$. In this section, we shall want to construct a concrete and explicit functional model for a class of Γ_n -contractions of $(S_1, \dots, S_{n-1}, P)$ for which the adjoint $(S_1^*, \dots, S_{n-1}^*, P^*)$ has $n-1$ tuples of fundamental operators $(F_1, \dots, F_{n-1})$ satisfying the following conditions:

- (1) $[F_{n-i}, F_{n-j}] = 0$ for $i, j = 1, \dots, n-1$;
- (2) $[F_i, F_{n-j}^*] = [F_j, F_{n-i}^*]$ for $i, j = 1, \dots, n-1$.

The following proposition plays an important role for proving the model theorem.

Proposition 7.1 (Proposition-10.1,[53]). *Suppose T is a contraction and V is the minimal isometric dilation of T . Then T^* and V^* have defect spaces of same dimension.*

Theorem 7.2. Suppose $(S_1, \dots, S_{n-1}, P)$ is a Γ_n -contraction on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ such that the adjoint $(S_1^*, \dots, S_{n-1}^*, P^*)$ has commuting $n-1$ tuples of fundamental operators $(F_1, \dots, F_{n-1})$ with $[F_i, F_{n-j}^*] = [F_j, F_{n-i}^*]$ for $i, j = 1, \dots, n-1$. Let $(\hat{T}_1, \dots, \hat{T}_{n-1}, \hat{V})$ on $\mathcal{N}^* = \mathcal{H} \oplus \mathcal{D}_P \oplus \mathcal{D}_{P^*} \oplus \dots$ be defined as

$$\hat{T}_i = \begin{bmatrix} S_i & D_{P^*} F_{n-i} & 0 & 0 & \dots \\ 0 & F_i^* & F_{n-i} & 0 & \dots \\ 0 & 0 & F_i^* & F_{n-i} & \dots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{bmatrix} \text{ and } \hat{V} = \begin{bmatrix} P & D_{P^*} & 0 & 0 & \dots \\ 0 & 0 & I & 0 & \dots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & I & \dots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{bmatrix}$$

for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$. Then

- (1) $(\hat{T}_1, \dots, \hat{T}_{n-1}, \hat{V})$ is a Γ_n -co-isometry, $\mathcal{H}$ is a common invariant subspace of $\hat{T}_1, \dots, \hat{T}_{n-1}, \hat{V}$ and $\hat{T}_1|_{\mathcal{H}} = S_1, \dots, \hat{T}_{n-1}|_{\mathcal{H}} = S_{n-1}, \hat{V}|_{\mathcal{H}} = P$;
- (2) there is a orthogonal decomposition $\mathcal{N}^* = \mathcal{N}_1 \oplus \mathcal{N}_2$ into reducing subspace of $\hat{T}_1, \dots, \hat{T}_{n-1}, \hat{V}$ such that $\hat{T}_1|_{\mathcal{N}_1}, \dots, \hat{T}_{n-1}|_{\mathcal{N}_1}, \hat{V}|_{\mathcal{N}_1}$ is a Γ_n unitary and $\hat{T}_1|_{\mathcal{N}_2}, \dots, \hat{T}_{n-1}|_{\mathcal{N}_2}, \hat{V}|_{\mathcal{N}_2}$ is a pure Γ_n -co-isometry;
- (3) $\mathcal{N}_2$ can be identified with $H^2(\mathcal{D}_{\hat{V}})$, where $\mathcal{D}_{\hat{V}}$ has the same dimension as of $\mathcal{D}_P$. The operators $\hat{T}_1|_{\mathcal{N}_2}, \dots, \hat{T}_{n-1}|_{\mathcal{N}_2}, \hat{V}|_{\mathcal{N}_2}$ are unitarily equivalent to $T_{A_1+A_{n-1}^* \bar{z}}, \dots, T_{A_{n-1}+A_1^* \bar{z}}, T_{\bar{z}}$ on the vectorial Hardy space $H^2(\mathcal{D}_{\hat{V}})$, where $A_1, \dots, A_{n-1}$ are the $n-1$ -tuples of fundamental operators of $(\hat{T}_1, \dots, \hat{T}_{n-1}, \hat{V})$.

Proof. By Corollary-6.4, we conclude that $(\hat{T}_1^*, \dots, \hat{T}_{n-1}^*, \hat{V}^*)$ is minimal Γ_n -isometric dilation of $(S_1^*, \dots, S_{n-1}^*, P^*)$, where $\hat{V}^*$ is the minimal isometric dilation of P^* . By Proposition 5.3, it follows immediately that $(\hat{T}_1, \dots, \hat{T}_{n-1}, \hat{V})$ is the Γ_n -co-isometric extension of $(S_1, \dots, S_{n-1}, P)$. Therefore, we conclude that $\mathcal{H}$ is a common invariant subspace of $\hat{T}_1, \dots, \hat{T}_{n-1}, \hat{V}$ and $\hat{T}_1|_{\mathcal{H}} = S_1, \dots, \hat{T}_{n-1}|_{\mathcal{H}} = S_{n-1}, \hat{V}|_{\mathcal{H}} = P$. Since $(\hat{T}_1^*, \dots, \hat{T}_{n-1}^*, \hat{V}^*)$ is a Γ_n isometry, by Wold decomposition theorem, there is a orthogonal decomposition $\mathcal{N}^* = \mathcal{N}_1 \oplus \mathcal{N}_2$ into reducing subspace of $\hat{T}_1, \dots, \hat{T}_{n-1}, \hat{V}$ such that $\hat{T}_1|_{\mathcal{N}_1}, \dots, \hat{T}_{n-1}|_{\mathcal{N}_1}, \hat{V}|_{\mathcal{N}_1}$ is a Γ_n unitary and $\hat{T}_1|_{\mathcal{N}_2}, \dots, \hat{T}_{n-1}|_{\mathcal{N}_2}, \hat{V}|_{\mathcal{N}_2}$ is a pure Γ_n -co-isometry. Therefore, we can write $(\hat{T}_1, \dots, \hat{T}_{n-1}, \hat{V})$ with respect to the orthogonal decomposition as

$$\hat{T}_i = \begin{bmatrix} T_{1i} & 0 \\ 0 & T_{2i} \end{bmatrix} \text{ and } \hat{V} = \begin{bmatrix} V_1 & 0 \\ 0 & V_2 \end{bmatrix}$$

for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$. Since $\mathcal{D}_{\hat{V}} = \mathcal{D}_{V_2}$, one can easily show that $(\hat{T}_1, \dots, \hat{T}_{n-1}, \hat{V})$ and $(T_{21}, \dots, T_{2(n-1)}, V_2)$ have the same $n-1$ -tuples of fundamental operators. Also, by applying Proposition 4.4, we have the following:

- (1) $\mathcal{N}_2$ can be identified with $H^2(\mathcal{D}_{\hat{V}})$
- (2) The operators $\hat{T}_1|_{\mathcal{N}_2}, \dots, \hat{T}_{n-1}|_{\mathcal{N}_2}, \hat{V}|_{\mathcal{N}_2}$ are unitarily equivalent to $T_{A_1+A_{n-1}^* \bar{z}}, \dots, T_{A_{n-1}+A_1^* \bar{z}}, T_{\bar{z}}$ on the vectorial Hardy space $H^2(\mathcal{D}_{\hat{V}})$, where $A_1, \dots, A_{n-1}$ are the $n-1$ -tuples of fundamental operators of $(\hat{T}_1, \dots, \hat{T}_{n-1}, \hat{V})$.

Since $\hat{V}^*$ is the minimal isometric dilation of P^* , using Proposition 7.1 one can easily verify that $\mathcal{D}_{\hat{V}}$ has the same dimension as of $\mathcal{D}_P$. This completes the proof. $\square$

Acknowledgements: The authors gratefully acknowledge the help they have received from Dr. Shibananda Biswas, Dr. Subrata Sham Roy, Dr. Sayan Bagchi and Prof. Gadadhar Misra.

REFERENCES

- [1] W. Arveson, *Subalgebras of C^* -algebras*, Acta Math., **123** (1969), 141 -224.
- [2] W. Arveson, *Subalgebras of C^* -algebras II*, Acta Math., **128** (1972), 271 -308.
- [3] J. Agler, *Rational dilation on an annulus*, Ann. of Math., **121** (1985), 537 - 563.
- [4] J. Agler, J. Harland, B. J. Raphael, *Classical function theory, operator dilation theory, and machine computation on multiply-connected domains*, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. **191** (2008), 289 - 312.
- [5] J. Agler, Z. A. Lykova, N. J. Young, *Extremal holomorphic maps and the symmetrized bidisc*, Proc. London Math. Soc., **106** (2013) 781-818.
- [6] J. Agler, Z. A. Lykova, N. J. Young, *A case of μ -synthesis as a quadratic semidefinite program*, SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization, **51**(2013), 2472-2508.
- [7] J. Agler, J. McCarthy, *Pick Interpolation and Hilbert Function Spaces*, Graduate studies in mathematics **44**, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, R.I. (2002).

- [8] J. Agler, N. J. Young, *Operators having the symmetrized bidisc as a spectral set*, Proc. Edinburgh Math. Soc., **43** (2000), 195–210.
- [9] J. Agler, N.J. Young, *A commutant lifting theorem for a domain in $\mathbb{C}^2$ and spectral interpolation*, J. Funct. Anal. **161** (1999) 452–477.
- [10] J. Agler, N.J. Young, *The two-point spectral Nevanlinna-Pick problem*, Integral Equations Operator Theory **37**(2000) 375–385.
- [11] J. Agler, N.J. Young, *A Schwarz lemma for symmetrized bidisc*, Bull. Lond. Math. Soc. **33** (2001) 175–186.
- [12] J. Agler, N.J. Young, *The two-by-two spectral Nevanlinna-Pick problem*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **356** (2003) 573–585.
- [13] J. Agler, N.J. Young, *A model theory for Γ -contractions*, J. Operator Theory **49** (2003) 45–60.
- [14] J. Agler, N.J. Young, *The hyperbolic geometry of the symmetrized bidisc*, J. Geom. Anal. **14** (2004) 375–403.
- [15] H. Alexander, J. Wermer, *Several complex variables and Banach algebras*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, **35**; 3rd Edition, Springer, (1997).
- [16] T. Ando, *On a pair of commutative contractions*, Acta Sci Math **24** (1963), 88 – 90.
- [17] T. Ando, *Structure of operators with numerical radius one*, Acta Sci. Math. (Szeged) **34** (1973) 11–15.
- [18] H. Bercovici, C. Foias, L. Kerchy, B. Sz.-Nagy, *Harmonic analysis of operators on Hilbert space*, Universitext, Springer, New York, (2010).
- [19] T. Bhattacharyya, S. Pal, S. Shyam Roy, *Dilations of Γ -contractions by solving operator equations*, Adv. Math. **230** (2012), 577 – 606.
- [20] T. Bhattacharyya, Sneha Lata, H. Sau, *Admissible fundamental operators*, J. Math. Anal. Appl., **425** (2015), 983 –1003.
- [21] S. Biswas, S. Shyam Roy, *Functional models for n -contractions and characterization of Γ_n -isometries*, J. Func. Anal., **266** (2014), 6224 –6255.
- [22] B. Bagchi, G. Misra, *Contractive homomorphisms and tensor product norms*, J. Int. Eqns. Operator Th., **21** (1995), 255 - 269.
- [23] R. Bhatia, *Matrix Analysis*, Springer, (1997).
- [24] R. Bhatia, *Positive Definite Matrices*, Hindustan Book Agency, (2007).
- [25] J. B. Conway, *The Theory of Subnormal Operators*, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, (1991).
- [26] C. Costara, *The symmetrized bidisc and Lempert's theorem*, Bull. London Math. Soc. **36** (2004) 656–662.
- [27] C. Costara, *On the spectral Nevanlinna-Pick problem*, Studia Math., **170** (2005), 23–55.
- [28] R. E. Curto, *Applications of several complex variables to multiparameter spectral theory*, Surveys of Some Recent Results in Operator Theory, Vol. II, Pitman Res. Notes Math. Ser., Longman Sci. Tech., Harlow, **192** (1988), 25–90.
- [29] R. G. Douglas, P. S. Muhly, C. Pearcy *Lifting commuting Operators*, Michigan Math. J., **15** (1968), 385–395.
- [30] M. A. Dritschel, J. Rovnyak, *The Operator Fejér-Riesz Theorem*, Chapter in A glimpse at Hilbert space operators: Paul R. Halmos in Memoriam, Oper. Theory Adv. Appl., 207(2010), Birkhuser Verlag, Basel, 223–254.
- [31] M. Dritschel, S. McCullough, *The failure of rational dilation on a triply connected domain*, J. Amer. Math. Soc., **18** (2005), 873 - 918.
- [32] E. G. Effros, Z. J. Ruan, *Operator Spaces*, Oxford Univ. Press, Oxford, (2000).
- [33] A. Edigarian, W. Zwonek, *Geometry of symmetrized polydisc*, Archiv der Mathematik, **84** (2005), 364 -374.
- [34] B. Fuglede, *A commutativity theorem for normal operators*, Nat. Acad. Sci. **36** (1950), 35 - 40.
- [35] T. Gamelin, *Uniform Algebras*, Prentice Hall, New Jersey, (1969).
- [36] S. Gorai, J. Sarkar, *Characterizations of symmetrized polydisc*, To appear in Indian Jour. Pure and Applied Math., available at arXiv:1503.03473v1 [math.CV] 11 Mar (2015).
- [37] J. Holbrook, *Inequalities of von Neumann type for small matrices*, Function spaces(ed. K. Jarosz), Marcel Dekker, (1992), 189 - 193.
- [38] D. Hong-Ke, P. Jin, *Perturbation of spectrums of 2×2 operator matrices*, Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society, **121** (1994), 761 - 766.
- [39] R. A. Horn, C. R. Johnson, *Matrix Analysis*, Cambridge University Press, 2nd Edition, (2013).
- [40] M. Jarnicki, P. Pflug, *On automorphisms of the symmetrized bidisc*, Arch. Math.(Basel) **83** (2004), 264 -266.
- [41] L. Kosinski, W. Zwonek, *Extremal holomorphic maps in special classes of domains*, Annals of the Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa - Science Class, doi: 10.2422/2036- 2145.201401 003.
- [42] L. Lempert, *Complex geometry in convex domains*, Proc. Intern. Cong. Math., Berkeley, CA (1986) 759–765.
- [43] G. Misra, A. Pal, C. Varughese *Contractivity and complete contractivity for finite dimensional Banach Spaces*, arXiv:1604.01872.
- [44] G. Misra, S. Shyam Roy, Genkai Zhang, *Reproducing kernel for a class of weighted Bergman spaces on the symmetrized polydisc*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., **141** (2013), 2361 - 2370.
- [45] G. Misra, *Completely contractive Hilbert modules and Parrott's example*, Acta Math. Hungar., **63** (1994), 291 - 303.
- [46] G. Misra, N. S. N. Sastry, *Contractive modules, extremal problems and curvature inequalities*, J. Funct. Anal., **88** (1990), 118 - 134.
- [47] G. Misra, N. S. N. Sastry, *Completely contractive modules and associated extremal problems*, J. Funct. Anal., **91** (1990), 213 - 220.

- [48] G. Misra, V. Pati, *Contractive and completely contractive modules, matricial tangent vectors and distance decreasing metrics*, J. Operator Th., **30**(1993), 353 - 380.
- [49] N. Nikolov, P. Pflug and W. Zwonek, *The Lempert function of the symmetrized polydisc in higher dimensions is not a distance*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **135** (2007) 2921-2928.
- [50] N. Nikolov, P. J. Thomas and T. Duc-Anh, *Lifting maps from the symmetrized polydisc in small dimensions*, arXiv:1410.8567.
- [51] S. Pal, *From Stinespring dilation to Sz.-Nagy dilation on the symmetrized bidisc and operator models*, New York Jour. Math., **20** (2014), 545 - 564.
- [52] S. Pal, *The Failure of rational dilation on the tetrablock*, J. Funct. Anal., **269** (2015), 1903 -1924.
- [53] S. Pal *Rational dilation on the symmetrized tridisc: failure, success and unknown*, arXiv:1610.00425
- [54] S. Pal *Properties of operators related to a Γ_3 -contraction and unitary invariants*, arXiv:1610.01978
- [55] S. Pal *On decomposition of operators having Γ_3 as a spectral set*
- [56] S. Parrott, *Unitary dilations for commuting contractions*, Pac. J. Math., 34 (1970), 481 - 490.
- [57] G. Pisier, *An Introduction to the Theory of Operator Spaces*, Cambridge Univ. Press, (2003).
- [58] V. Paulsen, *Completely Bounded Maps and Operator Algebras*, Cambridge Univ. Press, (2002).
- [59] V. Paulsen, *Representations of Function Algebras, Abstract Operator Spaces and Banach Space Geometry*, J. Funct. Anal., **109** (1992), 113 - 129.
- [60] P. Pflug, W. Zwonek, *Description of all complex geodesics in the symmetrised bidisc*, Bull. London Math. Soc. **37** (2005) 575-584.
- [61] V. Ptak, N. J. Young, *A generalization of zero location theorem of Schur and Cohn*, Trans. Inst. Electrical Electron. Automat. Control, **25** (1980), 978 -980.
- [62] M. Rosenblum, *Vectorial Toeplitz operator and the Fejer-Riesz theorem*, J. Math. Anal. Appl., **23** (1968), 139-147.
- [63] W. Rudin, *Proper holomorphic maps and finite reflection groups*, Indiana Univ. Math. J., **31** (1982) 701 -720.
- [64] D. Sarason, *On spectral sets having connected complement*, Acta Sci. Math., **127** (1967), 179-203.
- [65] D. Sarason, *Generalized interpolation in H^∞* , Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., **127** (1967), 179- 203.
- [66] J. Sarkar, *Operator theory on symmetrized bidisc*, Indiana Univ. Math. J., **64** (2015), 847 -873.
- [67] I. Schur, *Über Potenzreihen die im Innern des Einheitskreises beschränkt sind*, Jour. für Math., I **147** (1917), 205 -232 ; II **148** (1918), 122 - 145.
- [68] Bela Sz.-Nagy, *Sur les contractions de l'espace de Hilbert*, Acta Sci. Math., **15** (1953), 87 -92.
- [69] J. J. Schaffer, *On unitary dilations of contractions*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., **6** (1955), 322.
- [70] E. L. Stout, *Polynomial Convexity*, Progr. Math., Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, (2007).
- [71] J. L. Taylor, *The analytic-functional calculus for several commuting operators*, Acta Math. **125** (1970), 1 -38.
- [72] J. L. Taylor, *A joint spectrum for several commuting operators*, J. Funct. Anal., **6** (1970), 172 - 191.
- [73] F. H. Vasilescu, *Analytic Functional Calculus and Spectral Decompositions*, Editura Academiei: Bucuresti, Romania and D. Reidel Publishing Company, (1982).
- [74] J. von Neumann, *Eine Spektraltheorie für allgemeine Operatoren eines unitären Raumes*, Math. Nachr. **4** (1951), 258 - 281.
- [75] N. J. Young, *Some analysable instances of μ -synthesis*. *Mathematical methods in systems, optimization and control*, Editors: H. Dym, M. de Oliveira, M. Putinar, Operator Theory

(A. Pal) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, INDIAN INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE, EDUCATION AND RESEARCH KOLKATA, MOHANPUR - 741 246, INDIA

E-mail address: avijitmath@gmail.com